This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

1 1059.19

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES IN THE LATER ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EMPIRES

BY

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, LTD.

1919

Digitized by Google

THE volumes of the University of Michigan Studies are published by authority of the Executive Board of the Graduate School of the University of Michigan. A list of the volumes thus far published or arranged for is given at the end of this volume.

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Studies

HUMANISTIC SERIES

VOLUME XIV

ASPECTS OF ROMAN LAW AND ADMINISTRATION

PART I. THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES

Digitized by Google

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

Digitized by Google

THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES IN THE LATER ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EMPIRES

BY

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND COMPANY

1919

All rights reserved

Digitized by Google

L
A - 7:59.19

Graduate School of Arts & Sciences

COPYRIGHT, 1919,
BY FRANCIS W. KELSEY

Set up and electrotyped. Published March, 1919.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

Digitized by Google

PREFACE

THE following study of the Master of the Offices is an attempt to throw more light upon the intricate administrative system obtaining in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires through a detailed treatment of the history and scope of one particular office. It is a development of work done in connection with a doctoral thesis on the *Roman Magistri*, some of the results of which are incorporated in the first chapter.

For directing his attention to the Late Roman and Byzantine field of historical research, as well as for constant guidance and suggestion in the preparation of this monograph, the writer's special acknowledgments are due to Professor W. S. Ferguson, of Harvard University. He is further under great obligation to Mr. William H. Murphy, of Detroit, whose generosity has made the publication of this study possible.

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN,
April, 1918.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: PAGE

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES . . 1

SOURCES AND LITERATURE 2

CHAPTER I. THE ROMAN MAGISTRI:

i. Masters who were Magistrates of the Roman Republic . . . 7

ii. Masters who were neither Public Officials nor Officers of Colleges, but who had a Recognized Position in Commercial and Social Organizations 7

iii. Masters whose Functions were Primarily Religious . . . 8

iv. Masters who were Officials in the Civil Service of the Roman Empire 13

v. Masters who were Officials in the Military Service of the Roman Empire 15

CHAPTER II. THE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE FROM THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE I: THE OFFICES OF THE PALACE . . 17

CHAPTER III. THE HISTORY OF THE MASTERSHIP OF THE OFFICES:

i. The Establishment of the Office 24

ii. The Mastership from 337 to 600 A.D. 33

iii. The Mastership in the Byzantine Empire to the Latin Conquest in 1204 A.D. 49

CHAPTER IV. THE COMPETENCE OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES:

i. The Master of the Offices and the Palace Guards 60

ii. The Master of the Offices and the *Officia Palatina* . . . 63

iii. The Master of the Offices and the *Agentes in Rebus* . . . 68

iv. The Master of the Offices and the *Cursus Publicus* . . . 74

v. The Master of the Offices and the *Mensores* 80

vi. The Master of the Offices and the *Scrinia* 82

vii. The Master of the Offices and the State Arsenals 86

viii. The Master of the Offices, the *Limites*, and the *Duces* . . . 89

ix. The Master of the Offices and the Imperial Consistory . . . 91

x. The Ceremonial Duties of the Master of the Offices . . . 98

xi. The *Officium* of the Master of the Offices 100

xii. The *Domesticus* of the Master of the Offices 104

xiii. Characteristics of the Mastership 105

Digitized by Google

PAGE

CHAPTER V. THE TITLES, HONORS, AND PRIVILEGES OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES:

i. The Roman Period 110
ii. The Byzantine Period 117

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

i. Greek and Latin Texts 127
ii. Modern Works 128

APPENDIX A:

References to Magistri in Roman Literature and Inscriptions . . 131

APPENDIX B:

i. The Masters of the Offices to the reign of Michael III . . . 148
ii. The Byzantine Masters 151

INDEX 155

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE volumes of the University of Michigan Studies are published by authority of the Executive Board of the Graduate School of the University of Michigan. A list of the volumes thus far published or arranged for is given at the end of this volume.

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Studies

HUMANISTIC SERIES

VOLUME XIV

ASPECTS OF ROMAN LAW AND ADMINISTRATION

PART I. THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES

Digitized by Google

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

Digitized by Google

THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES IN THE LATER ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EMPIRES

BY

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND COMPANY

1919

All rights reserved

Digitized by Google

Δ
AH 7059.19
✓

Graduate School of Arts and Science

COPYRIGHT, 1919,
BY FRANCIS W. KELSEY

Set up and electrotyped. Published March, 1919.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

Digitized by Google

PREFACE

THE following study of the Master of the Offices is an attempt to throw more light upon the intricate administrative system obtaining in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires through a detailed treatment of the history and scope of one particular office. It is a development of work done in connection with a doctoral thesis on the *Roman Magistri*, some of the results of which are incorporated in the first chapter.

For directing his attention to the Late Roman and Byzantine field of historical research, as well as for constant guidance and suggestion in the preparation of this monograph, the writer's special acknowledgments are due to Professor W. S. Ferguson, of Harvard University. He is further under great obligation to Mr. William H. Murphy, of Detroit, whose generosity has made the publication of this study possible.

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN,
April, 1918.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: PAGE

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES . . 1

SOURCES AND LITERATURE 2

CHAPTER I. THE ROMAN MAGISTRI:

i. Masters who were Magistrates of the Roman Republic . . . 7

ii. Masters who were neither Public Officials nor Officers of Colleges, but who had a Recognized Position in Commercial and Social Organizations 7

iii. Masters whose Functions were Primarily Religious . . . 8

iv. Masters who were Officials in the Civil Service of the Roman Empire 13

v. Masters who were Officials in the Military Service of the Roman Empire 15

CHAPTER II. THE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE FROM THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE I: THE OFFICES OF THE PALACE . . 17

CHAPTER III. THE HISTORY OF THE MASTERSHIP OF THE OFFICES:

i. The Establishment of the Office 24

ii. The Mastership from 337 to 600 A.D. 33

iii. The Mastership in the Byzantine Empire to the Latin Conquest in 1204 A.D. 49

CHAPTER IV. THE COMPETENCE OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES:

i. The Master of the Offices and the Palace Guards 60

ii. The Master of the Offices and the *Officia Palatina* . . . 63

iii. The Master of the Offices and the *Agentes in Rebus* . . . 68

iv. The Master of the Offices and the *Cursus Publicus* . . . 74

v. The Master of the Offices and the *Mensores* 80

vi. The Master of the Offices and the *Scrinia* 82

vii. The Master of the Offices and the State Arsenals 86

viii. The Master of the Offices, the *Limites*, and the *Duces* . . . 89

ix. The Master of the Offices and the Imperial Consistory . . . 91

x. The Ceremonial Duties of the Master of the Offices . . . 98

xi. The *Officium* of the Master of the Offices 100

xii. The *Domesticus* of the Master of the Offices 104

xiii. Characteristics of the Mastership 105

Digitized by Google

PAGE

CHAPTER V. THE TITLES, HONORS, AND PRIVILEGES OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES:

i. The Roman Period 110
ii. The Byzantine Period 117

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

i. Greek and Latin Texts 127
ii. Modern Works 128

APPENDIX A:

References to Magistri in Roman Literature and Inscriptions . . 131

APPENDIX B:

i. The Masters of the Offices to the reign of Michael III . . . 148
ii. The Byzantine Masters 151

INDEX 155

Digitized by Google

THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES

INTRODUCTION

I. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES

THE Master of the Offices interests the student of the government of the Later Roman Empire, and invites his close attention, for various reasons.

First, no parallel to this officer can be found among the government ministers of modern states, and even among those of the Empire itself the Master of the Offices occupied a singular position; for while the other great officers of state controlled branches of the administration easily definable and possessing some essential unity, his sphere of activities was made up of an aggregation of various powers which brought him into touch with the most diverse functions of the government.

The Mastership of the Offices, too, had a long and interesting history, extending over the period from the reconstruction of Diocletian until the Latin conquest of Constantinople. From a comparatively inconspicuous beginning, by a series of additions to its competence, it became one of the most honorable and influential of the civil offices of the Empire. Then its power began to decline as it had arisen: one after the other its active functions were transferred to new offices, and, finally, it ceased altogether to be an administrative office, and remained solely as a title of honor. Thus arose the grade of dignitaries bearing the title of Master simply, no longer that of Master of the Offices. This was the final stage in the history of the Mastership.

Not only is the story of this office interesting in itself but the study of its development also illustrates, through a concrete

Digitized by Google

example, many of the important changes that affected the character of the imperial Roman administrative system as a whole, and gives one an insight into the detailed working of that vast governmental machine.

II. SOURCES AND LITERATURE

The chief contemporary sources of information regarding the Master of the Offices are the Codes of Theodosius II and Justinian, with the *Novellae*[1] of Theodosius II, Valentinian III, Majorian and Justinian, which afford the best aid in reconstructing the historical development of that office up to about the middle of the sixth century A.D.

A list of the departments of the administration under the control of this Master at the end of the first quarter of the fifth century is preserved in the catalogue of the officials of the Empire known as the *Notitia Dignitatum*, compiled in its present form by about 425 A.D.[2] The *Notitia* also gives the organization of the Master's personal office at the same period. Equally important information regarding the Master of the Offices in the Gothic Kingdom of Theodoric in Italy in the first part of the sixth century is afforded by the *formula magisteriae dignitatis*, contained in the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, dating from 537 A.D. A brief and somewhat confused sketch of the growth of the Mastership up to the time of Justinian is given in the *De magistratibus imperii Romani* (περὶ ἀρχῶν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας) of Johannes Lydus, written in 551 A.D. The *Kletorologion* of Philotheus, a list of the imperial dignitaries and functionaries at the end of the ninth century, prepared in 899, gives the position of the Masters, at that time forming an order of rank, among the dignitaries of the Empire, and the inaugural ceremony to this grade as well as its distinctive insignia. For the part played by these Masters in the various ceremonies of the Byzantine court in the tenth century, and also for considerable information regarding similar duties of the Master of earlier centuries, we are indebted to the *De Ceremoniis* (Ἔκθεσις τῆς βασιλείου τάξεως) of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (912–58).

[1] The editions of the *Novellae*, as of other works frequently cited, are indicated in the Bibliography, pp. 127–129.

[2] Mommsen, *Hermes*, vol. 36, pp. 544-47.

Digitized by Google

In addition, incidental references to Masters of the Offices, which are useful in throwing light upon the character and scope of the Mastership, are found throughout the literary material in general, chiefly, as might be expected, in that of a historical character, which has survived from the period between the opening of the fourth and the close of the twelfth century.

Of modern works which, directly or indirectly, are useful for the study of the Mastership of the Offices, the oldest is Gothofredus's edition of the Theodosian Code[1] with its learned commentaries. The work of other early commentators has been summed up and superseded by Böcking in extensive notes to his edition of the *Notitia Dignitatum* (1839–53).

Karlowa's *Römische Rechtsgeschichte* (vol. 1, 1880), Schiller in the second volume of his *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1887), and J. S. Reid's chapter on the "Reorganization of the Empire" in the *Cambridge Mediæval History* (vol. 1, 1911) offer the most satisfactory general surveys of the functions of the Master of the Offices at the height of his power. More valuable for the close study of this office are the contributions of Otto Seeck in his *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* (vol. 2, 1901) and his article *comites* in the Pauly-Wissowa *Real-encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (vol. 4, 1901). These have the merit of offering the most satisfactory view of the origin of the Master's office and of putting it in its proper relation to the general reorganization of the court and the administration at the opening of the fourth century.

Upon the position of the Mastership in the Gothic Kingdom of Italy and in the Eastern Empire at the close of the fifth and the first part of the sixth century much light is thrown by Mommsen's *Ostgothische Studien* (1889–90). As important for the later history of the Mastership as the works of Seeck for the earlier period is J. B. Bury's *Imperial Administration in the Ninth Century* (1911), which shows clearly the steps by which the Mastership was changed from an administrative office to an honorary title of rank, and indicates the general tendencies at work within the Empire which were responsible for this evolution.

What is still lacking is a complete history of the Mastership that will cover the whole period of its existence and trace clearly,

[1] First published at Paris, in 1549.

Digitized by Google

so far as is possible, in their proper chronological order, the various stages of its development and its decline, showing the connection between these changes and the general tendencies which affected the administration as a whole. Ancient as well as modern historians recognized that the powers of this office at its height were the result of a long period of growth, but the tendency has been to neglect the stages of the process and consider only its results. The works of Seeck and Bury supply the necessary corrective for two distinct epochs. It is the aim of this study to treat the entire history of the Mastership in the spirit of these historians.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER I

THE ROMAN *MAGISTRI*

THE word *magister* contains the idea of superior power. It is probably a derivative from *magis*, and is applicable to that one of any group of individuals who has more authority than the rest.[1] Paulus[2] says that it was given as a title to persons "to whom is entrusted the special superintendence of affairs, and who, above the rest, owe diligence and care to the business of which they are in charge." The verb *magistrare* contains the same idea, being equivalent to *moderare* or *regere et temperare*.[3] *Magister* never had the force of *dominus*, 'lord,' which contains the idea of possession. It was this simple yet wide meaning of the word *magister*, so closely akin to that of our own Master, that permitted its adoption as an official title in practically all branches of Roman public and private life.

The office of a Master was called a *magistratus*, 'magistracy,' or, more usually, a *magisterium*, 'mastership.'[4] The antonym of *magister* is *minister*, and both have their corresponding feminine forms, *magistra*, 'Mistress,' and *ministra*.[5]

Under the Roman Republic, at least in historic times, *magister* was but sparingly used as a title of political officials, although its

[1] *Qui magis ceteris potest*, Varro, *De lingua latina*, 6, 83; *magister, maior in statione*, Isid. 10, 170; cf. Paul. *Epit.*, 126, 152 M. *Magister* is a Latin word not appearing in Greek until after the Roman conquest, and then as a borrowed term, in the forms μάγιστερ, μάγιστρος (the regular spelling), and μαγίστωρ; cf. Forcellini, *Lexicon*; Stephanus, *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*; Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Graecitatis*. The older Latin form was *magester* (Quint. 1, 4, 18).

[2] *Digesta*, L, 16, 57.

[3] Paulus, *loc. cit.* It also appears in the form *magisterare*.

[4] *Magistratus*, *C.I.L.* I, p. 43, *epistula consulum de Bacchanalibus*; Paulus, *Epit.*, 126 M. *Magisteria*, *id.*, 152.

[5] *Minister*, Isid. 10, 170.

Digitized by Google

abstract *magistratus* was the regular term used to designate both the ordinary political office itself and the holder of such an office, who derived his power from popular election, or its substitute, co-optation.[1] Mommsen[2] thought that *magister* was not used of the public magistrates because the word originally denoted a single person endowed with superior authority and, consequently, was less suited than the abstract *magistratus* to officials organized on the collegiate principle. But the fact is that, as Mommsen admits, we find colleges of Masters in *vici*, *pagi*, *municipia* and other corporations, which shows that there is nothing inherent in the meaning of the word that conflicts with the idea of collegiality. Perhaps the explanation is that when Roman political thinking required a general term for magistrates, *magister* was already too commonly employed in other spheres to make its use convenient here. In the bureaucracy of the Empire the title Master appears much more frequently than under the Republican régime. However, in both periods the appellative Master, owing to the necessity of avoiding confusion in the case of a title capable of such wide application, was always accompanied by some qualifying epithet, as, for example, Master of the Horse (*magister equitum*) or Master of the Census (*magister census*); so that the whole phrase, and not the word Master alone, formed the title of the office. Only in the late Byzantine Empire, when the title of Master was restricted, first to one office, and then to members of an order of rank, did it dispense with such qualification.

In the other spheres of Roman life, social, religious, and commercial, Master as a title was in widespread usage. Festus[3] says that there were Masters, not only of the liberal arts, but also of rural districts, of associations, and of villages or city quarters. The various uses of the word "president" may offer an English analogy.

It will facilitate a survey of the Roman Masters to divide them into several groups, based upon the character of the offices which they held, and, to a certain degree, corresponding chronologically to the extension of the use of Master with an official significance. Therefore the following general classification is suggested:

[1] Paul. *Epit.*, 126 M.; Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, vol. 1, p. 8.

[2] *Loc. cit.*, A. 1. Varro's explanation, *De ling. lat.* 5, 82, is impossible.

[3] Paul. *Epit.*, 126 M.: *Magistri non solum doctores artium sed etiam pagorum, societatum, vicorum, equitum dicuntur, quia hi magis ceteris possunt.*

Digitized by Google

Masters who were Magistrates of the Roman Republic.
Masters who were neither Public Officials nor Officers of Colleges, but who had a recognized position in Commercial and Social organizations.
Masters whose functions were primarily religious:
Masters who were not Officers of Colleges, but who formed a College themselves, acting on behalf of a community in a public capacity.
Masters who were Officers of Colleges.
Masters who were Imperial Officials in the Civil Service of the Roman Empire.
Masters who were Imperial Officials in the Military Service of the Roman Empire.

We shall now proceed to a dicussion of the Masters who fall within each of these categories and thus establish the relation of the title Master of the Offices to other official titles in which the word Master occurs.

I. Masters who were Magistrates of the Roman Republic

These Masters may be dismissed with a very brief mention. They were only two in number, namely, the Master of the People (*magister populi*) and the Master of the Horse (*magister equitum*). In historic times the name of Master of the People no longer appears, but has been supplanted by that of Dictator. On the contrary, the Master of the Horse persisted until the abolition of the Dictatorship in 44 B.C. These two titles, however, show that the use of Master to denote an official of state was probably as old as the Roman Republic itself.

II. Masters who were neither Public Officials, nor Officers of Colleges, but who had a Recognized Position in Commercial and Social Organizations

In this rather miscellaneous section have been grouped such Masters as were not civil or military authorities of the state or of municipalities, or religious officials bearing a public character or serving in private associations, but nevertheless occupied positions which, in common usage and in the eyes of the law, authorized them to bear that title.

All the titles of this class, with the possible exception of the Shopmaster (*magister tabernae*), were in current usage during the republican epoch and date from a period so far back of the earliest records which we have of their presence that it is impossible to determine just when they came to be generally employed. How-

Digitized by Google

ever, as can be seen by a glance at the appended list, the various titles represent a wide range of interests — legal, social, educational, commercial, and agricultural. And, since the presence of regular official titles indicates a certain degree of order and regularity in the conduct of affairs, one must place the introduction of these Masters at a time when Rome had attained a sufficient stage of material and cultural advancement to require the systematic organization of the various activities of her citizens. Thus the Master in Bankruptcy (*magister auctionis*) is the fruit of considerable legal experimenting with bankruptcy cases; the Schoolmasters (*ludimagistri*) presuppose a fairly widespread demand for elementary education; the Master of the Companies of *publicani* (*magister societatis*) is the product of a well-developed system of tax farming; the Master of the Herd (*magister pecoris*) and the Taskmaster (*magister operum*) can only have appeared with a well-organized and widely extended system of ranching and farming on a large scale, *i.e.* with a great territorial expansion of the state; while the Shipmaster (*magister navis*) is a figure which doubtless first arose after the appearance of Rome as a world power and mercantile factor in the Mediterranean basin, in a period subsequent to the unification of the Italian peninsula.

Thus the presence of each of these Masters indicates a considerable advance in the power and material resources of the Roman state and points to a period far removed from the origins of civic development, a fact not necessarily true of the public officials, the Master of the People and the Master of the Horse, who probably antedate all the Masters mentioned here.

The following are the Masters who may be included in this group:

1. *Magister auctionis*, Master in Bankruptcy.
2. *Magister bibendi*, Toastmaster.
3. *Ludimagistri*, Schoolmasters.
4. *Magister navis*, Shipmaster.
5. *Magister operum*, Taskmaster.
6. *Magister pecoris*, Master of the Herd.
7. *Magister societatis*, Company Master.
8. *Magister tabernae*, Shopmaster.

III. Masters whose Functions were Primarily Religious

This is by far the largest class of Masters. It includes all those whose chief duties were connected with the performance of certain religious rites, no matter what organization or combination of in-

Digitized by Google

dividuals they represented in this capacity, and who had, therefore, a priestly character.

However, the position occupied by these Masters will be seen more clearly if we distinguish two types of Masters within the general class under consideration. The organization of the various groups of Masters who fall within the class has been adopted as the basis of this subdivision, because the Masters themselves, and not the cults which they directed, interest us here. Therefore, they have been classified in two groups, Masters who, like the Roman magistrates, themselves formed a college, and Masters who were officers within larger colleges of which they were members. It happens that the Masters of the first subdivision, without exception, at the same time bore a public character as the representatives of political units recognized in the Roman governmental system; while the second group embraces Masters who, thanks to their presence in public priestly colleges, possessed in some measure this public character, and others, again, who lacked it entirely.

We shall now consider a little more closely the Masters of each of these subdivisions.

1. *Masters who were not Officers of Colleges, but who formed a College themselves, acting on Behalf of a Community in a Public Capacity*

Such Masters existed in Rome, in Italy, and throughout the provinces of the Roman Empire, and were present in the various *coloniae*, *municipia*, *vici*, *pagi*, *fora*, and *castella*, as well as in the *conventus* and *cannabae* of Roman citizens, which lay outside the Roman municipal system.

However, the Masters in these several political units were not all organized in like fashion nor possessed of identical powers. Indeed, in no two forms of communal organization do the colleges of Masters present exactly the same features, with the exception of the Masters of the Shrines (*magistri fani*) in the colonies and other municipalities. Two characteristics, nevertheless, were common to all and determine their place in this classification; namely, their collegiate organization and the religious nature of their functions. The latter might or might not be combined with duties of a purely secular character, which, however, did not overshadow the religious side of the office. Furthermore, these sacral functions were exercised by the Masters as representatives of the

Digitized by Google

whole of the members of the body politic to which they belonged — their canton, village, ward, city, etc., — and in this sense the Masters were public officials.

The scope and importance of the secular powers of such Masters varied according to the stage of political development attained by the community to which they belonged; more definitely, according to the number and character of the magistrates officiating there. Thus we find Masters in a barrack village (*vicus cannabensis*), in the absence of regular magistrates, assuming the part of representatives of their community in all respects where it was called upon to act as a unity. A similar position was taken by the Masters in the Roman *conventus* on Delos, who were nothing more than Masters of Shrines,[1] while, in fully developed municipalities, such were merely the curators of particular shrines and, apparently, had no secular duties whatever. This latter type of Masters appeared also in cantons and villages, forming secondary colleges with strictly religious functions, even when other colleges of Masters stood at the head of the community.

The early development of such colleges of Masters is older than our records. We meet the system in operation in the second century B.C.; we see it adopted in the municipal organization of the following century, then in full bloom under the Principate; in some cases it persisted after the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine.

The following is the list of Masters of this group:

1. *Magistri pagi*, Masters of the Canton or District.
2. *Magistri vici*, Masters of the Village or Quarter.
3. *Magistri municipii*, Municipal Masters.
4. *Magistri castelli*, Masters of the Castellum.
5. *Magistri curiae*, Masters of the Curia.
6. *Magistri fani*, Masters of the Shrine.
7. *Magistri Fundi* and *Magistri Saltus*, Masters of the Estate and Masters of the Domain.

2. *Masters who were Members, and at the Same Time Officers, of Colleges, whose Membership included Others than the Masters themselves.*

These Masters differ from those of the preceding group in being the official representatives, not of some community organized on a political basis, or an administrative division of the same, but of a corporation or society, whether religious or secular. Here the

[1] Reference may be made to my article, *Magistri in Campania and Delos*, published in *Classical Philology*, vol. 10 (1915), pp. 25-45.

Digitized by Google

Masters themselves did not constitute the college, although often they may be said to have formed a college within a college, but were officers for the remaining members, whose number varied according to the character of the respective associations.

This class of Masters includes on the one hand Masters of colleges intrusted with the performance of public cults, and on the other Masters of other religious and secular colleges.

a. Masters of Colleges intrusted with the maintenance of Public Cults

Among the colleges which were responsible for the maintenance of the public cults (*sacra publica*), in Rome and elsewhere throughout the Empire, we have to distinguish priestly and non-priestly organizations. The priestly colleges were those in which all of the members were priests, as in the college of the pontiffs or that of the quindecemvirs. The non-priestly colleges included the remaining religious colleges of the group in question, in which the only true priests were those annually elected from among the ordinary lay members, as, for example, in the colleges of the Mercuriales.[1]

This difference in the constitution of the two sorts of colleges brought with it, as would naturally be expected, a corresponding difference in the position and functions of the Masters in the respective classes. Here, however, it will be sufficient to indicate the titles of the Masters belonging to the colleges of each sort.

The following Masters belong to the priestly colleges:

1. *Magister Fratrum Arvalium*, Master of the Arval Brothers.
2. *Magister Haruspicum*, Master of the Haruspices.
3. *Magister Collegii Lupercorum*, Master of the Lupercal College.
4. *Magister Pontificum*, Master of the Pontiffs.
5. *Magister Quindecemvirum Sacris Faciundis*, Master of the Quindecemvirs.
6. *Magister Saliorum*, Master of the Salii.
7. *Magister Sodalium Augustalium Claudialium*, Master of the Augustan and Claudian Sodales.

The Masters of the non-priestly colleges were:

1. *Magistri Augustales*, Masters of the Augustales.
2. *Magistri Capitolinorum*, Masters of the Capitolini.
3. *Magistri Ceriales*, Masters of the Ceriales.
4. *Magistri Martini*, Masters of the Martini.
5. *Magistri Mercuriales*, Masters of the Mercuriales.
6. *Magistri Collegii Minervae*, Masters of the College of Minerva.
7. *Magistri Herculanii*, Masters of the Herculanii.

[1] Cf. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, p. 404, n. 7.

Digitized by Google

b. Masters of other Religious and Secular Colleges

Here are grouped in one section the Masters of all colleges, religious, funerary, social, professional, or of any other character, which differ from the religious colleges of the preceding class in not being charged with the maintenance of a public cult. It is not necessary to make separate categories for the Masters of the several varieties of colleges included in this section, because the organization of all these colleges was the same in its general features, and the position held by the Master was alike in each; and also because, in many cases, it is extremely difficult to determine under which category a particular college falls.[1] The designation of these colleges as *privata* has been avoided, following the example of San Nicolo,[2] who points out the inexactness of the use of this term with reference to many of the Roman corporations.

Mistresses, in place of Masters, are found in colleges whose members were women only, and in others where a considerable number of the female sex were enrolled they appear in company with Masters. In many colleges there were Ministers, *ministri*, who acted as the assistants of the Masters; also attendants of the other sex, *ministrae*, occupying a corresponding position with regard to the Mistresses.

In general, it may be said that, while the Masters of these colleges regularly acted as a board of annually or quinquennially elected Presidents exercising a general supervision over all the activities of their respective corporations, their most characteristic duties were in connection with the celebration of the particular cult which was the focus of the life of their institution. From this consideration they may justly be regarded as Masters whose functions were primarily religious.

For a list of these Masters and their colleges, which would be too long to be duplicated here, one may refer to Appendix A, or to the third volume of Waltzing's *Corporations Professionelles.*

[1] Cf. Mommsen, *De collegiis et sodaliciis Romanorum*; Schiess, *Die römischen collegia funeratica*; Liebenam, *Römisches Vereinswesen*; Waltzing, *Les corporations professionelles chez les Romains*; cf. also Ruggiero, *Dizionario Epigraphico*, vol. 2, pp. 340 ff.; Kornemann, Pauly-Wissowa *Realencycl.*, vol 4, pp. 386–88.

[2] *Aegyptisches Vereinswesen*, vol. 1, p. 2 ff.

Digitized by Google

IV. Masters who were Officials in the Civil Service of the Roman Empire

The Masters who were officers in the civil service of the Roman Empire included: Masters who were in the service of the Financial Administration; Masters who were the chiefs of the Central Secretarial Departments; the Master of the Audiences and the Master of the Offices.

1. *Masters who were in the Service of the Financial Administration*

This group comprises Masters and Vicemasters (*promagistri*) who were imperial revenue officers in the period of the Early Principate, as well as Masters who were officials of the Fiscus and the Res Privata during the period of transition in the third century and after the reorganization of Diocletian and Constantine.

From the Early Principate we have record of the following Masters and Vicemasters: the Master and Vicemaster of the five per cent Inheritance Tax (*magister, promagister xx hereditatium*), the Vicemaster of the Inheritances (*promagister hereditatium*), the Vicemaster of the Port Dues (*promagister portuum*), and the Vicemaster of the Grain Rent (*promagister frumenti mancipalis*).

That branch of the imperial finances known as the Privy Purse (*res privata*), which from the time of Septimius Severus denoted the personal property of the Emperor, numbered among its officials several bearing the title of Master. These were the Master of the Privy Purse (*magister privatae rei*) and the Masters of the Privy Purse in the provinces (*magister privatae rei Africae, Aegypti et Libyae*, and the *magister aeris sive privatae rei* in Pontus and Asia).

The Fiscus, the treasury into which flowed the revenues that accrued to the Emperor in his official capacity as head of the state, also had some Masters in its service; namely, the Master of the Imperial Accounts (*magister summarum rationum*), the Masters of the Linen Wardrobe (*magistri lineae vestis*), and the Masters of the Private Wardrobe (*magistri privatae*).

2. *Masters who were the Chiefs of the Central Secretarial Departments*

Here belong the Masters of the Scrinia, or bureaus, through which the official correspondence of the central administration was conducted. The list of these Masters is as follows:

Digitized by Google

1. The Master of the *Memoria* (*magister memoriae*).
2. The Masters of the Latin and Greek Correspondence (*magistri epistularum latinarum et graecarum*).
3. The Master of the Petitions (*magister libellorum*).
4. The Master of the Sacred Inquests (*magister sacrarum cognitionum*).
5. The Master of the Imperial Schedules (*magister dispositionum*).

In addition to these Masters of the Scrinia, we must place here the Master of the Census (*magister censuum, census*) and the Master of the Records (*magister studiorum*).

3. *The Master of the Audiences and the Master of the Offices*

The Master of the Offices (*magister officiorum*), who forms the subject of this essay, will receive detailed consideration in the following chapters. The Master of the Audiences (*magister admissionum*) was one of his subordinates and had no independent sphere of action.

Among the civil officials of the Empire the title of Master makes its appearance towards the end of the first century A.D. It was then used as the title of certain officials employed in connection with the raising of the revenue, which at that time was being removed from the hands of private contractors and placed under imperial control. Other officials engaged in this same service had the title of Vicemaster. It seems clear that these titles were taken over into the imperial offices from the private corporations of tax-collectors, *societates publicanorum*, at the same time that the government assumed the responsibility for the raising of taxes. By the end of the second century these Masters and Vicemasters had disappeared, probably owing to a reorganization of the procuratorial system.

In the third century appears another group of Masters. The title was then used of the officials in charge of the various departments (*curae, officia, scrinia*) of the imperial administration centered at the capital. These Masters were not new officers, but merely the older *ab admissionibus*, *a censibus*, *a cognitionibus*, *ab epistulis*, *a libellis*, *a memoria*, and *a studiis* under new names. This can be seen at a glance from the transitional form of their titles, such as *magister ab admissione*, *magister a censibus*, and *magister a libellis*. It was probably under Diocletian, prior to 297 A.D., that these titles took their final forms.

It is perhaps impossible to say why the title of Master was

Digitized by Google

chosen for these bureau chiefs. One might think that the Masters of the priestly colleges, in which there was usually only one such official, furnished the model. But it was probably the general adaptability of this title, as indicating the one who assumed the direction or leadership in any field, that determined its adoption here.

Meanwhile the Masters had made their reappearance in the financial administration. In the course of the third century the director of the *res privata* became *magister* (*sacrae*) *privatae*, and the assistant of the chief of the fiscus was called *magister summarum rationum*. Both these titles disappeared before the close of the reign of Constantine I, and from then until towards 350 A.D. the supervisors of the *res privata* in the provinces enjoyed the title of *magistri* (*rei*) *privatae*. In this branch of the administration the title of Master was probably used in imitation of the practice in vogue in the secretarial departments.

In the course of the fourth century there were appointed in the Eastern Empire the minor officers known as the Masters of the Linen Wardrobe, *magistri lineae vestis*, and Masters of the Private Wardrobe, *magistri privatae* (*vestis*). At the same time, in both East and West, the Master of the Sacred Inquests disappeared through the merging of his bureau with that of the Master of the Petitions. Contemporary, also, is the abolition of the office and Mastership of the Records (*magister studiorum*).

The Masters of the Scrinia disappeared in the West upon the establishment of the Gothic Kingdom in Italy, and, in the East, after the reign of Justinian they were known by their Greek titles only.

The date of the creation of the Mastership of the Offices and that of its disappearance will be discussed in the following pages.[1]

V. Masters who were Officials in the Military Service of the Empire

In the Roman armies of the Principate there were several officers of low rank who were called Masters. We know of a Master of Artillery (*magister ballistarius*), a Master of the Cohort (*magister cohortis*), a Master of the Horse (*magister equitum*), a

[1] Further details relative to the Masters in the Imperial Civil Service are given in *Roman Magistri in the Civil and Military Service of the Empire*, by A. E. R. Boak, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XXVI (1915), pp. 73 ff.

Digitized by Google

Riding Master (*magister kampi*), and a Master of the Numerus (*magister numeri*). In the Later Empire we meet with another of these subordinate Masters, the Master of the Camp (*magister castrorum*).

However, it was during the Later Empire that the title Master came to denote once more, as in the republican epoch, officers clothed with the highest military command. This use of the Mastership was revived by Constantine I, probably in imitation of the Republican Mastership of the Horse. These military Masters at first had the specific titles of Master of the Foot (*magister peditum*) and Master of the Horse (*magister equitum*). But from the middle of the fourth century they began to be designated Masters of the Horse and Foot (*magistri equitum et peditum*), Masters of Both Services (*magistri utriusque militiae*), and finally as Masters of the Soldiers (*magistri militum*). In the East, from the time of Theodosius I, no further distinction between the infantry and cavalry commands was made, but in the West, officially at least, the difference was maintained.

Originally there were but two Masters of the Soldiers for the whole Empire. However, their number increased with the tendency of the rulers to divide the Imperial authority between two or more partners. Upon the definite separation of the Empire into two parts, in 395, there were five Masters of the Soldiers in the East and three in the West. Under Justinian at least two new Masterships were created.

These military Masterships disappeared by the end of the seventh century, owing to the loss of the Western part of the Empire to the barbarians, and the civil and military reorganization in the East.[1]

From this brief survey of the use of the title Master among the Romans, it will now be possible to approach the study of the Master of the Offices with a better understanding of the title itself and also of its position relatively to that of similar titles borne by both public and private officials.

[1] For a detailed treatment of these *magistri militum*, cf. the paper *Roman Magistri*, previously cited.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II

THE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE FROM THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE I: THE OFFICES OF THE PALACE

THE rivalry between the Senate and the Princeps for the control of the administration of the Roman world, which was the outgrowth of the dualism created by Augustus, and which persisted throughout nearly three centuries, by the fourth century A.D. had resulted in a complete victory for absolutism. The Senate had seen the spheres of government once under its control pass, one by one, into the hands of the Princeps and his officers, until finally, although it still continued to exist, that body, formerly so powerful, could claim no control whatever over the affairs of state.

Not only had the position of the senate as an organ of government completely changed, but its character also had been radically altered. The senatorial order was now a privileged class, comprising practically all the holders of important public offices, while the actual assemblies of the senate were composed chiefly of the highest officers of state. Thus the senate was made up of imperial officers and ex-officers. This development naturally removed all distinction between equestrian and senatorial offices; while the contrast between the equestrian and the senatorial *cursus honorum* gave place to one between the purely military and the purely civil careers.

The republican assemblies had long since ceased to be summoned, and such of the republican offices as still continued to be filled had lost all political power and had become merely honorary posts in the gift of the ruler.

The government of the Later Roman Empire was thus an undisguised absolutism. This conception of the position of the Emperor found formal expression at first in the deification of

Digitized by Google

Diocletian and his co-rulers, and later in the claim of his successors to govern by the will of God. The use of the diadem, and the attribution of the adjectives *sacer* and *divinus* not only to the imperial personage but to all that belonged to him, were further outward manifestations of absolute power.

The Emperor was the sole possessor of legislative and executive authority. Consequently, all the public officials were his servants, — appointed by him, owing allegiance to him alone, deriving from him their authority, existing to enforce his ordinances and responsible to him for the way in which they fulfilled their duties. The number and power of this official class are among the outstanding features of the governmental organization of the Later Roman Empire. The vast system of state officials, radiating from the administrative centres and permeating all the provinces, was a veritable millstone hung about the necks of the unhappy provincials, upon whom lay the double burden of supporting the army and the civil list.

The enormous increase in the number of the officials in the Later, over that in the Early, Empire was partly due to the desire of the emperors to prevent the rise of usurpers, and secure the peaceful succession to the imperial throne in a definitely settled fashion. Accordingly, no office was to be left so powerful that it could be made the basis of an attempt at an insurrection. The provinces, following a policy already initiated under the Principate, were divided and subdivided into smaller units until they numbered about one hundred and twenty, in place of the forty-five of Hadrian's time. No longer was civil and military authority held by the same officer, and accordingly a large number of purely military posts was created.

Besides the greater number of officials required for the new administrative districts and the new military commands, a further increase in the ranks of the civil service was due to the extension of the central administrative bureaus developed from those of the older régime, and to the creation of a series of household officers in charge of the imperial palace. The appointment of these latter officers was the result of the organization of the imperial court on a scale commensurate with the dignity of the autocratic sovereign, who thereby exalted himself above his subjects and by almost impenetrable barriers checked access to his person. The pomp and splendor of the court, its elaborate ceremonies and the

Digitized by Google

employment of eunuchs in the personal service of the ruler, betray oriental, probably Persian, influences.

The administrative organization of the Roman Empire was essentially bureaucratic in character: that is to say, the greater part of the business of state was conducted through a series of departments controlled by offices or bureaus centred at the court and having representatives in the various administrative districts of the Empire. It was in these departments that the great army of government officers and their subordinates were employed. This bureaucratic organization, although the result of a development continuous throughout the first three centuries, received its definite form and dated its power from the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, the two Emperors who cast the Roman system of government into the form which it kept from the beginning of the fourth to the end of the sixth century.

To secure efficiency in the working of this complicated government machine the minor officials in the several departments were regularly placed under the orders (*sub dispositione*) of those having wider spheres of action. Thus a system of graded subordination was established, whereby the control was ultimately concentrated in the hands of a group of the highest civil and military officials, about ten in number, who were directly in touch with the Emperor and responsible to him alone. These were the heads of the army and of the administrative, judicial, and financial organs of the state; and alongside of them, because of their position at the head of similarly organized departments, may be placed the officers in control of the management of the imperial estates and of the imperial household.

True to the principle of mistrust towards its servants, however, the imperial government did not always clearly define the spheres of competence of the several official groups, believing that from this cause rivalries and jealousies would arise, through the officials spying upon and hampering one another, to the advantage of the throne. Further, direct communication between the subordinates of the great ministers and the Emperor was often provided for, and, finally, by a highly developed system of state espionage the ruler kept watch upon the actions of his officers. However, in spite of the precautions taken to insure an honest and efficient administration, the actual result of the development of this elaborate bureaucratic system was the erection of an almost impassable

Digitized by Google

obstacle between the Emperor and his subjects. Neither did their complaints reach his ears, nor were his ordinances for their relief effective, because the officials coöperated with one another to conceal their misdemeanors and to enrich themselves at the expense of the provincials.

Within official circles, in addition to the administrative subordination, there was established a strict hierarchy of rank, based upon the classification, into a number of grades, of all the official posts in the imperial service. This gradation was due, on the one hand, to the development of an oriental court life with its elaborate ceremonial demanding a fixed order of precedence among those present at imperial audiences, and, on the other, to the growth in the number and importance of the public officials, which of itself necessitated a classification of the various official posts from the point of view of rank. All officials occupying posts of sufficient importance became members of the senatorial order and were styled *clarissimi*. Among these a narrower circle of higher officials formed the class of the *spectabiles*, and a still more exclusive order, comprising only the heads of the various departments of government, was that of the *illustres*. Subsequently, under Justinian, a still higher grade, that of *gloriosus*, was created.

Among the different offices belonging to the same class a definite order of precedence was established. The official positions which conferred such titles of rank upon their holders were called *dignitates*. The great demand for admission to these rank classes, which entitled their members to various privileges, caused the conferment of honorary *dignitates;* the titles of official posts with their appropriate rank but without the duties of office. These honorary dignities were conferred as rewards for past services, as indications of favor, or even in return for a monetary consideration.

Besides these classes, defined in terms of official rank, there existed two orders or titles of rank, which were of a somewhat different character from the preceding as they were not altogether dependent upon any fixed office. These were the Patriciate and the Comitiva. The former, created by Constantine I in imitation of the older Patrician order, although not attached to any definite official post, was granted solely to the highest dignitaries; it was conferred for life, and gave precedence over all officials except the functioning consuls. The latter order, which was given a new

Digitized by Google

meaning by Constantine, became a title of honor attached to some public offices, or conferred as a reward for service or for favor. In certain cases, with a suitable adjunct, it designated a definite office, such as 'Count of the Sacred Largesses,' or Minister of the Treasury, *comes sacrarum largitionum*. There were three grades of Counts (*comites*) — Counts of the First, Second, and Third orders — distinguished according to the importance of their official position.

The sharp distinction, already referred to, made between the civil and the military careers, gave rise to a division of the offices of state into the two classes of *militares* and *civiles*. The functions of these two classes were strictly separated. Thus in the provinces where troops were stationed the civil and the military authority were no longer united in the hands of the provincial governor (*praeses*, *corrector*, *iudex*); he was now restricted to the oversight of the civil administration, while the military command was exercised by a *dux* or *comes rei militaris*. On the one hand, the civil governors were subordinated to the Vicars (*vicarii*) of the thirteen dioceses into which the provinces were grouped, and to the Pretorian Prefects, who presided over the highest appellate jurisdiction, with the exception of that of the court of the Emperor himself, and who likewise controlled the raising and distribution of the taxes paid in natural products. On the other hand, the military governors were under the Masters of the Soldiers (*magistri militum*), the newly-created commanders-in-chief, who were themselves subject to the Emperor alone.

The centralization of the administration, which has been briefly outlined above, was intimately bound up with the working of the *consistorium*, the Imperial Consistory or Council of State. This was mainly composed of the Ministers at the head of the various departments of the administration. These were the Minister of Finance, known as the Count of the Sacred Largesses (*comes sacrarum largitionum*), who controlled the revenues of state apart from those which passed into the hands of the Prefects: the Minister of Crown Lands, called the Count of the Privy Purse (*comes rerum privatarum*), who administered the imperial property and who was now a public official, since the importance of the imperial domains and the almost complete identification of the ruler with the state had made the management of his revenues a matter of public business: the Quæstor, who was the Emperor's adviser

Digitized by Google

in legal and judicial matters: and the Master of the Offices (*magister officiorum*), the subject of this study.

In attendance upon the Consistory were also without doubt the Prefect whose seat of government was at the Capital, and the Grand Chamberlain (*praepositus sacri cubiculi*). Since they were permanently attached to the court, the administrative center of the Empire, these offices were called *dignitates palatinae*, to distinguish them from those official posts which kept their holders in the provinces. Other *dignitates palatinae* were the Counts of the Body Guard (*comes domesticorum equitum* and *comes domesticorum peditum*), the Steward of the Household (*castrensis sacri palatii*), and the Chief Eunuch of the Bed-chamber (*primicerius sacri cubiculi*), who was a subordinate of the Grand Chamberlain. To these must be added the four imperial Secretaries — the First Secretary (*magister memoriae*), the Secretary for Correspondence (*magister epistularum, magister epistularum graecarum*), the Secretary for Petitions (*magister libellorum*), all of whom were engaged in receiving or transmitting the correspondence of the central government; and, from the middle of the fourth century, the Secretary of the Imperial Schedules (*magister*, later *comes*, *dispositionum*).

In addition to the holders of these important posts, there was attached to the court a great host of subordinates employed in the civil administration of the Empire or in the management of the palace. These functionaries in general were known as *officiales*. Among them must be reckoned the Corps, or *schola*, of the *agentes in rebus*, who served in various capacities as imperial messengers or secret service men; also the *tribuni* and *notarii*, clerks employed in the Consistory, and the *advocati*, lawyers assigned to the various tribunals.

Moreover, each one of the palace dignitaries mentioned above was aided in the performance of his duties by a staff of clerks, who constituted his *officium*. Under the Principate, such clerks had been freedmen or slaves. Now, however, they were freemen, for as in the new régime the person of the Emperor was exalted above the persons of his subjects, so those engaged in his service were no longer upon the same level as the servants of other men, but the very fact of their presence in the imperial offices was a guarantee of their freedom.

Since Diocletian had virtually transformed his palace into a

Digitized by Google

moving camp, these clerks and all others in the palace service had been given a military organization, with a system of promotion, insignia, and special privileges copied from those of the army. Their service itself was called a *militia*. Serving for long periods in the one office they made possible regularity and continuity in the routine administration of their department in spite of the frequent change of their chief. The lowest grades of these palace servants included such as performed menial service at the court, from the ushers (*admissionales*) to the torch-bearers (*lampadarii*), grooms, and others whose duties were of the same general character.

Nor did the palace lack its regular soldiery. These were the Palace Guards, the seven *scholae scutariorum et gentilium*, 3500 strong, who had been established by Constantine to take the place of the disbanded Pretorian Guard. These Scholarians belonged to the regular army, the *militia armata*, but, as a rule, did not serve away from the court.

Such were the officials and servants who were attached to the imperial court, which served as the administrative centre of the Empire. And it was at this court, among the *dignitates palatinae*, that the Master of the Offices played his rôle.[1]

[1] Surveys of the official positions in the Empire are to be found in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, and the *De Magistratibus* of Lydus.

For a detailed treatment of the governmental organization of the Later Empire, cf. Grenier, *L'empire byzantin*, vol. 2; Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. 1, pt. 2, chap. 12; Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, pp. 828 ff.; Reid, *Cambridge Mediæval History*, vol. 1, chap. 2; Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, vol. 2, p. 101 ff.; Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. 2, pp. 52–109, *Hof und Provinzen*.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORY OF THE MASTERSHIP OF THE OFFICES

THE history of the Mastership of the Offices may be divided conveniently into three periods: the establishment of the office under Diocletian and Constantine; the period from the death of Constantine, in 337 A.D., to the close of the sixth century; and the Byzantine period, to the Latin conquest in 1204 A.D.

I. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE

The date of the establishment of the office of *magister officiorum* is unknown, and the record thereof, as well as the names of its first holders, had passed into oblivion when Johannes Lydus wrote his *De Magistratibus Populi Romani*, about the middle of the sixth century.[1] The earliest Master of the Offices then known was Martinianus, who held that post under Licinius at the close of the latter's reign (307–324 A.D.).[2] This Martinianus was evidently the one called by Zosimus[3] the chief of the palace *officia*, with the explanation that the Romans styled this personage the Master of the Offices. During his final struggle with Constantine, Licinius created Martinianus Caesar, but the latter, upon the defeat of Licinius in 324 A.D.,[4] was captured and executed.[5]

However, constitutions of the Theodosian Code record that at this time there were Masters of the Offices under Constantine in the West, where Heraclianus was *tribunus et magister officiorum*

[1] Περὶ ἀρχῶν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας, written in 551 A.D. When the title *magister officiorum* is used in the *Historia Augusta* it refers to the *magistri scriniorum* of the third century.

[2] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 25.

[3] Zosimus, 2, 25: ἡγεμόνα τῶν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τάξεων ὄντα μάγιστρον τοῦτον ὀφφικίων καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι.

[4] For the date of the battle of Chrysopolis, September 18, 324, see Jouguet, *Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions, Bulletin*, 1906, pp. 231–236.

[5] Zosimus, 2, 28.

Digitized by Google

in 321,[1] and Proculianus likewise *tribunus et magister officiorum* in 323.[2] Upon his victory over Licinius, Constantine appointed Palladius as his Master of the Offices, and the list of his successors in this office down to the time of Lydus was found by the latter in the work of Petrus upon this *magisterium*.[3]

The earliest epigraphic record of a Master of the Offices is much later; it is found in an inscription in honour of Flavius Eugenius, who had been *magister officiorum* under Constans in 346 A.D.[4]

Now from these notices we see that there were Masters of the Offices at the court of each of the two Augusti, Licinius and Constantine, before the latter reunited the Roman world under one ruler, and, consequently, it does not seem likely that Constantine was the creator of this office. And further, when we consider that it was Diocletian who effected the organization of the palace service on a military basis, as a *militia*, and that the title *tribunus*, which the early Masters of the Offices bore, is of a purely military character at this period, the evidence seems to point to his having established the office in question.[5]

The precise character of this office at the time of its creation is just as uncertain as the date of its establishment. Naturally, therefore, various views have been advanced on this point.

Mommsen[6] thought that possibly Diocletian or Constantine had appointed an official to preside over the *consistorium* and had given him a *vicarius* in the person of the *vicarius a consiliis sacris*, and that these two offices subsequently developed into those of the *Quaestor Sacri Palatii* and the Master of the Offices,

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, XVI, 10, 1.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 9, 1.

[3] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 25: Παλλάδιον μάγιστρον τῆς αὐλῆς ἐχειροτόνησεν. τοῖς δὲ ἰμειρομένοις τοὺς ἐφεξῆς μὴ ἀγνοῆσαι μαγίστρους ἄρχις ἡμῶν ἀρέσκει πρὸς διδασκαλίαν Πέτρος . . ., δι' ὧν αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ λεγομένου μαγιστηρίου ἀνεγράψατο. The reference is probably to a part of the Περὶ πολιτικῆς καταστάσεως of Petrus the Patrician, a work of which only fragments have survived; cf. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, p. 236.

[4] Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, 1244: FL(avio) EUGENIO V(iro) C(larissimo), EX PRAEFECTO PRAETORIO, CONSULI ORDINARIO DESIGNATO, MAGISTRO OFFICIORUM OMNIUM, COMITI DOMESTICO ORDINIS PRIMI OMNIBUSQUE PALATINIS DIGNITATIBUS FUNCTO, OB EGREGIA EIUS IN REM PUBLICAM MERITA; etc. For the date of his mastership, cf. Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantinum*, c. 3; cf. also *C. I. L.* VI, 1721.

[5] Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. 2, pp. 89–90.

[6] *De C. Caelii Saturnini titulo, Memorie dell' Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica*, 1865, p. 298 ff. The suggestion here made is followed by Cosenza, *Official Positions after Constantine*, p. 55.

Digitized by Google

respectively. The objection to this view is that it does not afford an adequate explanation of the early character of the Master's office, as will appear later; and, further, that the nature of the duties of the *vicarius a consiliis sacris* is too hypothetical for any connection to be evident between them and the duties subsequently performed by the Master of the Offices. Moreover, the title of the latter does not suggest a development from that of the *vicarius*.

Schiller[1] has advanced the view that the Mastership of the Offices developed out of a superintendency of the four palace *scrinia*, presided over by the *magistri memoriae*, *magistri libellorum*, *magistri epistularum* and *magistri dispositionum*. With this suggestion Karlowa[2] agrees, arguing that the close connection between the spheres of duty of the several *scrinia* would necessitate a common chief to supervise their activities. The title *magister officiorum* (*palatinorum*) naturally, then, would be given to the chief of these *officia palatina*. This explanation of the origin of the office obviously contains a certain element of truth; for the supervision of the work of these secretarial departments was among the earliest of the duties of the Master of the Offices. However, it is evident that no theory on this subject will be adequate which does not account for the whole of the early title *tribunus et magister officiorum*.

Accordingly Schiller's alternative explanation[3] is preferable, in which he derives the Mastership of the Offices from the senior tribunate of the *cohortes praetorianae*. This is substantially the opinion of Seeck,[4] who believes that the Master of the Offices had the title of *tribunus* because he was placed by Diocletian over the several corps of the court attendants who were given a military organization (*militia*) and was himself an officer of the soldiers attached to the palace. As these various divisions of the palace servants were styled *officia*, the origin and meaning of the title *magister officiorum* are apparent.

Accepting this explanation as the one that best accords with what little is known of the early development of the office, we may picture to ourselves the establishment of the Mastership of

[1] *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, vol. 2, p. 101.
[2] *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, p. 831.
[3] *Op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 101.
[4] *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. 2, pp. 89–90.

Digitized by Google

the Offices as having taken place in the following way. Diocletian, having effected his reorganization of the *officiales* of the palace on a military basis, found it advisable to have a single officer in control of and responsible for their discipline, their *matriculae* or rolls, admission to and dismissal from service, order of seniority, regular promotion, uniform, and the like. Accordingly, he nominated to this post the senior tribune of the Pretorian Guard and gave him the additional title of *magister officiorum* to express his powers of supervision over the subordinates in the several *officia*. It is not clear why the term *magister* was employed in the new title, but it has already been noted that the heads of the *scrinia* were called Masters and it was, in fact, under Diocletian that their titles became fixed in the forms *magister memoriae*, *magister libellorum*, etc., which correspond exactly with that of *magister officiorum*. At this time, too, there were numerous other *magistri* at the court, for the title was one which, with an appropriate qualification, could be employed readily for officials with widely differing functions.[1] When, after the battle of Saxa Rubra in 312 A.D., Constantine disbanded the remnant of the Pretorians,[2] and formed in their place the new palace guards,[3] known as the Scholarians, each of the *scholae* was commanded by a *tribunus*,[4] and the senior officer of this rank probably was the Master of the Offices.

However, one cannot claim for the Master of the Offices authority over all the *officiales* of the palace, for it is fairly certain that those immediately under the orders of the *Praepositus Sacri Cubiculi* or Grand Chamberlain, — namely the *cubicularii* and *silentiarii*, as well as those at the disposal of his subordinate the *Castrensis*, the cooks, bakers, and pages, and those engaged in works of construction and repair at the court, — did not come under the Master's control in any way until a later date.[5] The same holds true of the *officiales* in the departments of the Sacred Largesses and the Private Accounts, who were at all times subject only to the Counts at the head of these branches of the

[1] *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXVI, 1915, pp. 112–114.

[2] Zosimus, 2, 17.

[3] Seeck, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 42.

[4] Ammianus Marcellinus, 20, 2, 5.

[5] That part of the *Notitia Dignitatum* which dealt with these offices unfortunately has not been preserved. For a reconstruction see Böcking, *Notitia Dignitatum*, vol. 2, pp. 293–301. On the *castrensiani* cf. Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa *Realencyclopädie der klass. Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 3, p. 1774 ff.

Digitized by Google

financial administration.[1] But we may attribute to the Master authority over those *officia* which we know from the *Notitia Dignitatum* to have been *sub dispositione eius* at the beginning of the fifth century, except in so far as they can be shown to have been placed in his charge at a date subsequent to the establishment of this office.

Thus, at this early period, in the opening years of the reign of Constantine I, the Master of the Offices was in command of the seven *scholae* of the palace guards, supervised the work of the chiefs of the secretarial bureaus (*scrinia*) and the discipline of those employed there, was in charge of the court ushers or *officium admissionum*, and likewise had under his orders various corps of palace servants, such as the *mensores*, 'quarterers,' and *lampadarii*, 'torchbearers.' But attention must be called to the fact that many of the palace *officia* were not subject to the orders of only one of the great officers of the court. It was quite possible for them in the execution of one part of their duties to be directed by one, in performing another part to be supervised by a second, of these functionaries. Thus from constitutions of 321[2] and 323[3] which refer to the Master's receiving correspondence relating to the damage of a public building and a report which gave rise to a legal decision, we may safely assume that at this time he was in charge of the general correspondence conducted by the *scrinia*. Yet it is probable that the Quaestor also in certain cases could command the services of the employees of the *scrinia*, for he subsequently had this right.[4] However, the relations between the Master of the Offices and other officials, whose spheres of action touched his own, will be considered in detail in a following chapter. The Master of the Offices himself, whose position, as we have seen, was in the beginning a comparatively humble one, did not from the first have charge of an independent department of the administration, under the supervision of the Emperor alone. Certainly, so far as the command

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI. 30, 4, 379 = *Codex Justinianus*, XII. 23, 4; *id.* 23, 12, (Theodosius and Valentinian).

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, XVI, 10, 1, . . . *de tactu amphitheatri* . . ., *de qua ad Heraclianum tribunum et mag(istrum) officiorum scribseras.*

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 9, 1: *litterae missae ad Proculianum tribunum et mag(istrum) officiorum continent quorundam provincialium mancipia abducta pro pignore sub officio retineri, . . ., atque haec mancipia neque dominos solutis debitis recepisse neque alios comparasse, veritos ne haec rescinderetur distractio.*

[4] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XII, *occ.* X.

Digitized by Google

of the palace guards is concerned, he was subordinate to the Pretorian Prefect, and it is fairly safe to assume that in general the Master was under the orders of the latter.[1]

Although, as we are warranted in believing, the foundations of this office were laid by Diocletian, it remained for Constantine to make it a great and influential position. Such development is to be explained in connection with radical changes made by Constantine in the organization of the administration. One of the results of these innovations, as Seeck[2] has pointed out, was the appearance of two groups of officials, the one military and the other civil, caused by the assignment of definite and permanent spheres of action to certain *comites*, who bore the general title of *comes*, with a specific title derived from the duties which they performed. The new military offices were those of *comes et magister equitum*, *comes et magister peditum*, *comes domesticorum equitum*, and *comes domesticorum peditum*. The civil *comites* were the *comes et quaestor sacri palatii*, the *comes et magister officiorum*, the *comes sacrarum largitionum*, and the *comes rerum privatarum*.

The reason for this creation of new offices, and change in the rank and competence of offices already existing, was the change made in the Pretorian Prefecture. Up to this time the Prefects had functioned for the Empire as a whole, and had been the chief military as well as the highest administrative and judicial officers. But when Constantine appointed his sons Caesars and placed them in authority over parts of the Empire while they were yet children, he had to entrust the actual work of administration to Prefects, who accompanied each of the young Caesars.[3] Thus the way was paved for the creation of the four Prefectures, of Gaul, Italy, Illyricum, and the Orient, with definite boundaries; an arrangement which was completed under Constantine's successors. This resulted in the separation of the office of Pretorian Prefect from the person of the ruler, and its association with specific administrative districts. At the same time the Prefects were deprived of military authority, lest those who administered the districts of the young princes should be tempted to use their powers to secure the

[1] Cf. Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10: ἀνάγκη γέγονε τόν ὕπαρχον μηκέτι μὲν τῆς αὐλῆς . . . ἄρχειν.

[2] Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, vol. 4, p. 632, s. v. *comites*.

[3] Seeck, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 64 ff., 83.

Digitized by Google

throne for themselves. The command over the military forces of the Empire was divided among the new group of military *comites*, who were directly under the orders of the Emperor.[1]

Not only was the Prefecture thus weakened by division and the loss of the right of military command; it was also at this time shorn of considerable civil authority. The fundamental reason for this, as in the case of the deprivation of military power, was doubtless the desire to lessen the Prefect's influence. A contributory cause may have been that the assignment of Prefects to those portions of the Empire which were allotted to the Caesars permanently separated the former from the centre of the administration, the court of the Augustus,[2] and therefore the supervision of the *officia palatina* was no longer regarded as an essential part of a Prefect's duties. Consequently, a successor to his functions in this sphere had to be found. Under such circumstances, it was only natural that the Master of the Offices should become independent of the Prefect's supervision and receive control of the branches of the administration which were conducted directly through those *officia palatina* that were already in part under his charge.

Accordingly, Lydus quite correctly connects the great increase in the power of the Master of the Offices with the weakening of the Prefecture, in saying that the control of the court passed into the hands of the Master at the same time that the *magistri militum* succeeded to the military command of the Prefects.[3] It is true that Lydus mentions only one Prefecture, that of the Orient, and misunderstands the reason for the Prefect's presence there, which was that the Orient formed one of the administrative divisions of the Empire which Constantine entrusted to his young Caesars, in this case to Constantius.[4] However, he justly emphasizes the rise of the *magistri militum* and the Master of the Offices at the expense of the Prefect; and also it seems that he believed that, as has been suggested, the separation of the Prefect from the person

[1] Zosimus, 2, 33; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 3, 40; Seeck, *op. cit.*, 83 ff.

[2] Evidence for this is that, from 318 A.D., the Pretorian Prefects begin to appear as frequent recipients of imperial constitutions. Seeck, *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. 49, p. 213.

[3] *De Mag.*, 2, 10 . . . ἀνάγκη γέγονε τὸν ὕπαρχον μηκέτι μὲν τῆς αὐλῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν ὅπλοις ἄρχειν δυνάμεων, τῆς μὲν τῷ λεγομένῳ μαγίστρῳ παραδοθείσης, τῶν δὲ τοῖς ἄρτι κατασταθεῖσι στρατηγοῖς ἐκτεθεισῶν, τὴν δὲ ἀνατολὴν πρὸς τῇ κάτω Ἀσίᾳ, καὶ ὅσα ταύτης, διοικοῦντα τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ἀνατολῆς χρηματίζειν ὕπαρχον; cf. 3, 40.

[4] Seeck, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 69; Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 1045 f.

Digitized by Google

of the Augustus had to do with his loss of control over the palace administration.

The greater importance of the Master's office caused a corresponding elevation in the rank of its holder, who was now no longer *tribunus* but *comes et magister officiorum*. That is to say, the position of Master of the Offices became one of the regular and definite spheres of competence assigned to a *comes*, as was the case with the *magisterium militum*. This change in title also marks the transformation of the office from one of a semi-military character, expressed in the title *tribunus*, to an essentially civil post.[1]

The date of the enlargement of the Master's functions, and his elevation to the rank of *comes*, is not recorded but may be fixed with considerable certainty. The earliest record of a Master who was a *comes* dates from 346 A.D.[2] and the combination *comes et magister officiorum* first appears in a constitution of 357 A.D.[3] However, as we have pointed out, there are good reasons for believing that these changes were accomplished by 325 A.D. The Master of the Offices in 362 appears as one of the *comites* who were permanent members of the *consistorium*, together with the Quaestor, the Count of the Sacred Largesses and the Count of the Privy Purse, with whom he was equal in rank, although taking precedence over the two Counts.[4] Since *comites* with the functions, although not with the ultimate titles, of these other officials can be traced back to 325, it is only reasonable to suppose that the Master of the Offices ranked with them at that date. As the latter, however, was still a *tribunus* in 323,[5] it must have been between this date and 325 that he was made a *comes*, for which change a convenient opportunity would have been afforded by the reorganization of the

[1] Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 632; *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. 2, pp. 77, 90. There is a certain parallel between the change of title in the case of the Master of the Offices and of the *comes sacri stabuli*. The latter was first *tribunus s. s.*, ranking as a *tribunus* of a *schola palatina* (Amm. 14, 10, 8; 20, 2, 5), later he received the *comitiva ordinis primi* (*Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 13, 1, 413) and was indifferently *comes* or *tribunus s. s.* (Dessau, Inscr. Sel. 1277, 1278), until finally the title of *tribunus* was discarded (*Codex Just.* XII, 11, 1), cf. Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 632. The parallel is not perfect, for the change in the Master's case was much more rapid and indicative of an important accession of power.

[2] Dessau, *Inscriptiones Selectae*, 1244: *magistro officiorum, comiti domestico ordinis primi.*

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 8: *et ad Musonium clarissimum virum comitem et magistrum officiorum referri.*

[4] *Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 39, 5; VI, 9, 1; VI, 30, 1; 4; IX, 14, 3, etc.

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 9, 1.

Digitized by Google

Empire following the defeat of Licinius on September 18, 324 A.D.[1] If this hypothesis is accepted, the first *comes* to fill the office of *magister officiorum* would be the Palladius whom Constantine made his Master of the Offices after reuniting the Empire.[2] This Palladius had acted as Roman ambassador on a diplomatic mission to the Persian court in the time of Galerius Maximian, and was therefore a person of considerable importance, worthy to be a member of the consistory and hold the Mastership of the Offices with its newly extended sphere of competence.

For the Master of the Offices now ceased to be dependent in any way upon the Pretorian Prefect, and became one of the eight great ministers whose administration was under imperial supervision only. Accordingly, the Master becomes the commander-in-chief of the *scholae palatinae*, no longer subject to the Prefect's orders. In like manner, in his control of the secretarial bureaus he is free from the latter's authority. It was probably at this time, too, that the corps of imperial despatch bearers, the *schola agentum in rebus*, came under the immediate direction of the Master of the Offices.[3] Seeck[4] believes that it was under Constantine that the Master of the Offices also assumed control of the government arsenals (*fabricae*), which had previously been centred at the court in the hands of a subordinate of the Prefect, the *praepositus fabricarum* (?). However, the first clear proof that the Master directed the administration of the arsenals comes from the year 390 A.D.,[5] although it must be admitted that in the interval we have no indication that the Prefect was active in this sphere. On the other hand nothing marks the transfer of this power to the Master.

Thus, at the close of the reign of Constantine the Great, the office of the *magister officiorum* was constituted essentially as it was at the time of the compilation of the *Notitia Dignitatum*, shortly before 425 A.D.[6] Perhaps the sole important extension of the powers of the Master in the meantime was the supervision of the use of the *cursus publicus* or State Post, although his authority in various respects required, and underwent, further definition in relation to that of other officers of state.

[1] Cf. p. 24, n. 4.
[2] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 35.
[3] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 25; cf. *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 9, 1.
[4] Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 6, p. 1928, s. v. *fabricae*; cf. Lydus, *l. c.*
[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, X, 22, 3.
[6] See p. 2.

Digitized by Google

It only remains to say a few words with regard to the number of *magistri officiorum* in the Empire up to the end of the reign of Constantine I. We have seen already that in 324 A.D., when two Augusti, Constantine and Licinius, ruled the Empire, each had his Master of the Offices.[1] We may, therefore, consider it most probable that this was the arrangement from the establishment of the office, and that the number of the Masters of the Offices correspond to that of the Augusti. So when Constantine became sole ruler in 324 there was but one Master, who was at his court.[2] Nor when Constantine appointed his sons as Caesars is there any evidence that they had Masters of the Offices in their immediate service.

II. The Mastership from 337 to 600 A.D.

From the time of Constantine until the end of the reign of Justinian the Master of the Offices continued to be one of the important administrative officials of the Empire, and the character of his office remained essentially the same, although his sphere of activity was considerably enlarged.

As we have seen, before the concentration of the imperial power in the hands of Constantine the Great the number of Masters of the Offices in the Empire probably was equal to the number of Augusti, and from this time until the death of Constantine there was, accordingly, only one Master. However, upon his decease, in 337 A.D., the imperial authority was again divided, this time among three Augusti. Each of these had his own administrative functionaries, among them his Master of the Offices, if we may draw this inference from the previous custom and the fact that Magnentius, who overthrew Constans and took the title of Augustus in 350 A.D., appointed his own Master of the Offices. His choice was Marcellinus, who had been Count of the Sacred Largesses under Constans and had actively supported the usurper.[3] But in 353 A.D. there was again but a single ruler of the Roman world, Constantius, and the officials of his former partners and rivals in power had disappeared. However, in 351 Constantius himself had raised his nephew Gallus to the dignity of a Caesar and appointed him to govern the Orient, with

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, XVI, 10, 1; XI, 9, 1; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 25; Zosimus, 2, 25.
[2] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 25.
[3] Zosimus, 2, 42; 43 fin.; 46, 3.

Digitized by Google

residence at Antioch.[1] There Gallus had his own court and palace officers, among whom was a Master of the Offices.[2] In 354 Gallus fell a victim to the suspicions of Constantius and his establishment was consequently dissolved.[3] Not much later, in 355, his brother Julian was made Caesar and sent to Gaul,[4] where he too had his own Master of the Offices. Pentadius, who held that post when Julian assumed the title of Augustus in 360, was despatched by him to announce this usurpation to Constantius,[5] and a little later the latter nominated a certain Felix as Julian's Master of the Offices, only to find that Julian had already promoted to this office Anatolius, who had been his *magister libellorum*.[6]

From 361 to 364 there was a brief period with only one Augustus for the whole Empire, and no Caesar to share in the administration. But from 364 to 395 there were regularly two Augusti, one governing the East and the other the West. In 364 the two were Valentinian and Valens, and each had a Master of the Offices under his orders, Ursatius under Valentinian in the West and Euphrasius with Valens in the East.[7] The same conditions prevailed under their successors until, with the practical division of the Roman Empire in 395, the duplication of the whole administrative system, as it appears in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, became permanent, and henceforth the presence of a Master of the Offices in each half was a necessity.

Turning now to consider the functions which the Master of the Offices exercised during the period in question, we find that the first extension of his powers occurred during the rule of Constantius and Constans (340–50 A.D.). Then it was that the Overseers of the State Post (*curiosi cursus publici*) were appointed from the corps of the *agentes in rebus*, instead of from the *memoriales* and other *palatini* as previously.[8] Thus the control of the use of the *cursus publicus* was transferred from the Prefects to the Master of the Offices. This change was accomplished before

[1] Zosimus, 2, 45.

[2] Ammianus, 22, 3, 3: *et Palladium primum ex magistro officiorum in Brittannos exterminarunt suspicione tenus insimulatum quaedam in Gallum composuisse apud Constantium, dum sub eodem Caesare officiorum esset magister.*

[3] Zosimus, 2, 55.

[4] Ammianus, 15, 8, 1; 13; Zosimus, 3, 2.

[5] Ammianus, 20, 8, 19.

[6] Ammianus, 20, 9, 5; 8.

[7] Ammianus, 26, 4, 4; 5, 7; 26, 7, 4; 10, 8.

[8] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI. 35, 2 (319); Gothofredus, *Paratit.* to *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29.

Digitized by Google

350, as we learn from an inscription from Thermae Selinuntiae, which dates between 340 and 350 and records a *ducenarius agens in reb(us) et p(rae)p(ositus) cursus publici.*[1] However, the respective powers of the Prefects and the Master in regard to the Post, especially relative to the right of issuing passes (*evectiones*), were not clearly defined until the end of the century.[2]

It was likewise under Constans that the inscription to Flavius Eugenius[3] was set up, which attributes to him the title of *magister officiorum omnium. Omnium* seems here to be an exaggeration, for, as has been pointed out, at this time the Master of the Offices did not have under his authority those classes of palace attendants which were under the orders of the Praepositus Sacri Cubiculi or the Castrensis. As we shall see, the Master acquired jurisdiction over them in the next century.

It was likewise somewhere about the middle of the fourth century that the Master of the Offices became practically a Minister for Foreign Affairs; that is to say, his office was the regular medium of communication between the Roman Emperor and foreign potentates. The origin of this development of the Master's functions was his direction of the court audiences, through his subordinates the *admissionales.* All admissions to the imperial presence, even in the case of Roman senators, were in this way controlled by him.[4] So it was naturally the Master of the Offices who received the ambassadors from other peoples, and it was through him that they were able to communicate with the Emperor or obtain an audience. In 365 the ambassadors of the Alemanni were greatly offended by their treatment at the hands of the Master, and, magnifying the insult, withdrew to stir up war.[5] Proofs of the Master's activities in this sphere are more

[1] *C.I.L.* X, 7200; cf. *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 1 (355); 2 (357).

[2] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 1859.

[3] Dessau, *Inscr. Sel.* 1244: FL(avio) EUGENIO V(iro) C(larissimo), EX PRAEFECTO PRAETORIO, CONSULI ORDINARIO DESIGNATO, MAGISTRO OFFICIORUM OMNIUM, COMITI DOMESTICO ORDINIS PRIMI OMNIBUSQUE PALATINIS DIGNITATIBUS FUNCTO, OB EGREGIA EIUS IN REM PUBLICAM MERITA: HUIC DD. NN. CONSTANTIUS VICTOR AC TRIUMFATOR SEMPER AUGUSTUS ET JULIANUS NOBILISSIMUS CAESAR STATUAM SUB AURO IN FORO DIVI TRAIANI, QUAM ANTE SUB DIVO CONSTANTE VITAE ET FIDELISSIMAE DEVOTIONIS GRATIA MERUIT, ADPROBANTE AMPLISSIMO SENATU SUMPTU PUBLICO LOCO SUO RESTITUENDAM CENSUERUNT.

[4] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, *occ.* IX; Ammianus, 15, 5, 18; Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium*, c. 3; Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 1, p. 382, s. v. *admissionales.*

[5] Ammianus, 26, 5, 7.

Digitized by Google

numerous from the succeeding centuries,[1] but there is no reason to doubt that by this time the Roman precedent had been established, in virtue of which their ambassadors to the Persian court in 579 A.D. declined to declare their business to any one but the official who corresponded to the Roman Master of the Offices.[2] Such duties as these necessarily involved the handling of considerable correspondence in foreign languages and consequently the staff of the Master included a number of official interpreters, the *interpretes diversarum gentium* of the *Notitia*.[3]

In the history of the relations between the Prefect of the Orient and the Master of the Offices at Constantinople the prefecture of Rufinus deserves especial mention. Lydus[4] says that "the power of the prefecture was diminished until the time of Arcadius, the father of Theodosius the Younger, under whom it happened that Rufinus, called the Insatiate, who was his Prefect, aimed at a tyranny, but failed in his purpose to benefit the state, and utterly ruined his office. For the Emperor thereupon deprived it of its military authority, then of the supervision of the arsenals, and of the State Post, and all the rest of the powers, of which the so-called Mastership is composed."

Taken literally, this statement implies that it was after the fall of Rufinus, in 395 A.D., that the Master of the Offices received the command of the Scholarians, with the control of the arsenals and of the State Post. However, we have already seen that the Master exercised all these powers by the middle of the fourth century; hence the statement of Lydus is, to say the least, confusing. But there must have been some reason why he connected the career of Rufinus with the dissolution of the Prefect's power, and the corresponding growth of the power of the Masters. Rufinus

[1] Priscus, *Frag.* 7, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, p. 77; Cassiodorus, *Var.* 6, 6; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 26; Corippus, *In laudem Justini*, 3, 233.

[2] Menander, *Fr.* 52, *Fragmenta Historiorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, p. 256: μαγίστρῳ, καθὰ τοῦτον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι.

[3] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI; *occ.* IX, *omnium gentium*; Priscus, *loc. cit.*, οἷα δὴ τῶν τε ἀγγελιαφόρων καὶ ἑρμηνέων καὶ στρατιωτῶν τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν βασιλείαν φυλακὴν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ταττομένων.

[4] *De Mag.*, 2, 10–3, 40: διεσύρη δὲ οὐδὲν ἧττον ἡ τῆς ἀρχῆς δυναστεία ἄχρι τῶν Ἀρκαδίου τοῦ πατρὸς Θεοδοσίου τοῦ νέου καιρῶν, ἐφ' οὗ συμβέβηκε Ρουφῖνον τὸν ἐπίκλην ἀκόρεστον, ὃς ἦν ὕπαρχος αὐτῷ, τυραννίδα μελετήσαντα τοῦ μὲν σκοποῦ ὑπὲρ λυσιτελείας τῶν κοινῶν ἐκπεσεῖν, εἰς βάραθρον δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν καταρρῖψαι. αὐτίκα μὲν γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων ἰσχύος ἀφαιρεῖται τὴν ἀρχήν, εἶτα τῆς τῶν λεγομένων φαβρικῶν οἱονεὶ ὁπλοποιῶν φροντίδος τῆς τε τοῦ δημοσίου δρόμου καὶ πάσης ἑτέρας, δι' ὧν τὸ λεγόμενον συνέστη μαγιστέριον.

Digitized by Google

had been Master of the Offices under Theodosius I,[1] was promoted by him to the Prefecture in 392,[2] and, upon the death of that Emperor in 395, as *praefectus praetorio Orientis* was left in practical control of the government in the eastern half of the Empire where the young Arcadius was but a nominal ruler. However, his rivalry with Stilicho, the western regent, and the jealousy of others at the court of Arcadius, led to his murder in that very year.[3] It is possible that Rufinus, aiming to establish his influence more firmly, subordinated the Mastership to the Prefecture, giving to the latter the powers which it had exercised before the reforms of Constantine I. Naturally, upon his fall the Master's Office would have regained its independence and the Prefecture would have been again reduced to the position which it had prior to 395, while its holders would be regarded with greater suspicion because it had formed the basis of the power of the late Minister. This is a possible explanation for the view of Lydus that at this date there was a sudden increase of the Master's sphere of duties, to the detriment of the Prefecture.

Towards the end of the fourth century the corps of the *decani* was added to the list of *officia* of palace servants. They were servitors of very low rank, being door-keepers and messengers in the service of the women of the imperial household.[4] These *decani*, like other brigades of court attendants of similar character, were placed under the orders of the Master of the Offices.[5]

From a consideration of the *Notitia Dignitatum* it is evident that up to about 425 A.D. the Masters of the Offices in both halves of the Empire exercised practically the same administrative functions.[6] The *Notitia* of the Occident, however, mentions the *cancellarii*, as one of the *officia* under the Master's authority, whereas they do not appear in that of the Orient. The *cancellarii* were attendants performing services in connection with the exercise of judicial functions by the higher magistrates in whose service they stood. However, those mentioned here were in the immedi-

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, X, 22, 3 (390); Zosimus, 4, 51: μάγιστρος τῶν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τάξεων καταστάς.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 6, 2; Ambrosius, *Ep.* 53, *Rufinus ex magistro officiorum factus est in consulatu praefectus praetorio.*

[3] Zosimus, 5, 1; 7; Seeck, *Geschichte*, vol. 5, pp. 267–9, 273–9.

[4] Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 2246.

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 31, 1 (year 416).

[6] *Notitia Dignitatum*, *or.* XI; *occ.* IX.

Digitized by Google

ate service of the Emperor, and so were classed with the other *palatini*. This corps of imperial *cancellarii* was probably established early in the fifth century. A possible explanation why they appear in the Western and not in the Eastern *Notitia* is that the former may here, as in some other instances, present a somewhat later phase of the administrative organization than the latter.[1] However, it may be that there was really no corresponding body of imperial *cancellarii* in the East, since there is no reference to them, although such officials were found in the office of the Prefects, and other high functionaries.[2]

As the list of those who were *sub dispositione magistri officiorum* in the East makes no mention of the *cancellarii*, so that in the West lacks the *mensores* and *lampadarii* which the former contains. This discrepancy can only be explained as an error of omission, for *lampadarii* were found at the Western court and were under the Master of the Offices.[3]

In the year 443 A.D. the Master of the Offices in the Orient received an addition to his sphere of duties that did not fall to the lot of the Western Master. This was the inspection of the condition of the troops and defences on the frontiers of the Orient and the preparation of an annual report thereon.[4] The Master of the Offices was selected for this purpose in the hope that a more accurate report on such matters would be presented by one who was not a military officer and who would, therefore, have little personal interest in the *duces;* for the *duces* were responsible for the condition of the *limites*. And the Master was the most logical civil official for this duty, as the corps of the *agentes in rebus*, or the imperial secret service, was under his orders, and, as a permanent member of the *consistorium*, he came directly into contact with the Emperor himself.

It was also during the fifth century that the Master of the Offices acquired considerable judicial authority, so that eventually his jurisdiction extended over practically all the *officiales* of the palace and over others who had not the same intimate connection with the Master as an administrative officer. A characteristic of the organization of the Later Roman Empire was that the magistrate was the general judge of his *officiales* in both civil and crimi-

[1] Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 3, pp. 1457–8.

[2] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 51: *de adsessoribus et domesticis et cancellariis iudicum*; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 3, 36.

[3] *Novellae Valentiniani*, III, 30 (450).

[4] *Novellae Theodosii*, 24.

Digitized by Google

nal cases, and that from his decisions there was no appeal.[1] There was, consequently, nothing unusual in the Master exercising jurisdiction over all those to whom he sustained the relation of administrative chief. However, the full judicial powers of the Master of the Offices were acquired more slowly than his civil authority and did not always coincide with the latter. It is probable that the Master began to exercise some jurisdiction over the various *officia* which stood under his orders as soon as they passed under his control. Nevertheless, at first, their members could be compelled to answer charges in other courts than that presided over by the Master. But gradually the privilege was granted them of defending themselves in his court only; and the other tribunals ceased to have jurisdiction over them.

The first notice of the exercise of judicial functions by the Master of the Offices occurs in a report of Symmachus, then Urban Prefect, dating from 384 or 385,[2] from which it is evident that at that time the Master had some judicial authority over the *stratores*, and hence, we may infer, over all the *officia palatina*. However, the Master's jurisdiction does not seem to have been exclusive at that early date.

Apparently the Master first exercised this exclusive judicial authority over the Scholarians, whose commander he was, and who could be summoned before no other tribunal than his, as is implied in a constitution of 443.[3] By this same constitution the *decani*, whom we have met already as the Master's subordinates in other respects, were placed in similar fashion entirely under his jurisdiction.[4]

However it was not until the reign of Leo I (457–74) and his successors Zeno (474–91) and Anastasius (491–518) that there was a marked extension of the Master's judicial functions. During this period he became sole judge of other classes of functionaries who had long been under his authority and also of the employees in various departments which, up to this time, had been free from his control. In addition, military officers and their subordinates,

[1] Bethmann-Hollweg, *Der römische Civilprozess*, vol. 3, 139.

[2] Symmachus, *Relationes*, [10], 38.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 26, 2: *Ad exemplum itaque devotissimorum scholarium nulli licere memoratos* (i.e. *decanos*) *ad aliud judicium trahere . . . praecipimus.*

[4] *Nostrae pietatis famulationibus adhaerentes decanos non oportet pro desiderio pulsantium ad alia protrahi judicia, sed viri illustris tantum magistri officiorum observare examen.*

Digitized by Google

and, in some cases, ex-officials of high rank came under the jurisdiction of the Master of the Offices. Leo and Anthemius (467–72) extended the Master's exclusive jurisdiction over the *cubicularii*,[1] the *fabricenses* in Constantinople,[2] and the *schola sacrae vestis*,[3] to whom were soon afterward added the *agentes in rebus*[4] and the *duces*, with their subordinates, *apparitores*, *limitanei*, and *castrorum praepositi*,[5] on the frontier of the Empire in the East. Under Leo II (Nov. 473–Nov. 474) and Zeno certain *officia* of *ministeriani* were given the protection of the court of the Master of the Offices,[6] and Zeno granted the *silentiarii* the same privilege.[7] This latter Emperor also placed the honorary *viri illustres*, resident in Constantinople, in special instances under the Master's judicial authority.[8] Finally, Anastasius put the members of the four *scrinia*[9] in possession of the same judicial privileges as the *ministeriani*, and from constitutions of Justinus and Justinian[10] it may be inferred that the *adjutores* of the Quaestor were upon an equal footing with the *scriniarii*.

Among these various classes of *officiales*, who are thus expressly mentioned as subject to the jurisdiction of the Master of the Offices, the *scholares*, *decani*, *fabricenses*, *agentes in rebus* and *scriniarii* were his subordinates in an administrative sense also, and this was the basis of his judicial authority over them. However, the *cubicularii*, *silentiarii*, and *schola sacrae vestis*[11] were under the orders of the Praepositus Sacri Cubiculi, while the *ministeriani* were the subordinates of the Castrensis, and hence in other respects beyond the control of the Master of the Offices. Why, in spite of this, they were placed under his jurisdiction, is best explained by the constitution dealing with the *silentiarii*.[12]

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 5, 3.

[2] *Op. cit.*, XI, 10, 6: *Eos, qui inter fabricenses sacrae fabricae sociati sunt*, etc.

[3] *Op. cit.* XII, 25, 3.

[4] *Op. cit.* XII, 20, 4 (Leo).

[5] *Op. cit.* XII, 59, 8 (Leo).

[6] *Op. cit.* XII, 25, 4: *sacro ministerio nostro deputatos, quorum officia singillatim brevis subter adnexus continet.* The *brevis* is unfortunately lost.

[7] *Op. cit.* XII, 16, 4.

[8] *Codex Justinianus*, III, 24, 3 (485–86).

[9] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 12.

[10] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 13; 14.

[11] This *schola* is to be distinguished from the officials of the *sacra vestis* who were under the *comes sacrarum largitionum*; cf. Böcking, *Notitia Dignitatum*, vol. 2, pp. 298. 337.

[12] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 16, 4: *Ne ad diversa tracti viri devoti silentiarii judicia sacris abstrahi videantur obsequiis, jubemus eos, qui quemlibet devotissimorum silentiariorum scholae vel ejus uxorem civiliter vel etiam criminaliter pulsare maluerint, minime eum ex cuiuslibet alterius judicio nisi ex judicio tantummodo viri excellentissimi magistri officiorum conveniri.*

Digitized by Google

From this we learn that the *officiales* of the Praepositus and the Castrensis were liable to prosecution in the court of the Master only, because the former functionaries lacked judicial authority and if summoned to appear before outside tribunals their subordinates were liable to be withdrawn for too long a time from the performance of their duties at the palace.

The same reason may have been partially responsible for granting the Master exclusive jurisdiction over his own subordinates. Such arrangements were of course very much to the advantage of the members of the various departments affected by them, and these included practically all the *palatini*, with the exception of the subordinates of the Count of the Sacred Largesses and the Count of the Privy Purse, who by a constitution of Theodosius II and Valentinian III (425–50) were granted the privilege of answering charges, except in a few specified cases, in the courts of these *comites* alone.[1]

In the case of the *duces* and their office staff and orderlies (*apparitores*), as well as the commanders of garrisons (*castrorum praepositi*) and border militia (*limitanei*) under their orders, the exercise of judicial powers by the Master of the Offices obviously grew out of his duty of inspecting the Eastern frontiers. For the *limites* under his supervision, which are mentioned specifically in the constitution of 443, are described in Justinian's Codex in general terms as those subject to his jurisdiction.[2] This was contrary to the practice that military officers should not exercise jurisdiction over civilians, nor the ordinary civil judges over *viros militares*,[3] and the Master was thus an exception in that members of both services were under his authority in this respect. Previously these *duces* and *limitanei* had been under the jurisdiction of their military superiors, the *magistri militum*,[4] and the latter still retained some judicial power over them, although the nature of this power is not clear.[5] This extension of the jurisdiction of the

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 23, 12: *Viros devotos palatinos non oportere in hac regia urbe apud virum illustrem praefectum urbis litigare compelli, nisi de aedificatione domorum et servitutibus et annonis orta videatur causa; in aliis vero causis tam pecuniariis quam criminalibus apud viros illustres tantummodo comites suos respondere.*

[2] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 4: *super omni limite sub tua jurisdictione constituto*; cf. *Novellae Theodosianai*, 24.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 29, 1 (386–7).

[4] Cf. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXVI, p. 148.

[5] *Op. cit.*; *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 59, 8: *illustribus scilicet ac magnificis viris magistris militum consuetudine ac potestate, si qua ad limites aliquos Orientis Thraciarum et Illyrici ex longo tempore hactenus obtinuit, reservata.*

Digitized by Google

Master of the Offices may, therefore, be regarded as an encroachment upon that of the Masters of the Soldiers, with the aim of bringing the control of the frontiers and their garrisons more strictly under the supervision of the court. Later, under Anastasius, when the *duces* were placed in command of the detachments of the central field army (*praesentales numeri*) in the diocese of the Orient, these troops remained under the jurisdiction of the *magistri militum praesentales*, which was exercised directly or through the courts of the *duces*.[1] However, Justinian ordered that all appeals coming from the court of a *dux* (*ducianum judicium*) should be decided by the Master of the Offices and the Quaestor of the Palace, acting conjointly.[2]

The *illustres* in Constantinople, who at times were subject to the Master's jurisdiction, were those known as the *honorarii*, i.e. those who had received the patents (*codicilli*) of an office entitling them to the Illustrissimate without their actually having filled such a post. Ordinarily, such *illustres* were under the jurisdiction of the Pretorian and Urban Prefects, but by a special order of the Emperor they could be brought before the court of the Master of the Offices.[3]

The Master of the Offices in the Occident certainly did not exercise jurisdiction over the *duces* of the Western Empire, owing to the strict subordination of these to the *magister peditum praesentalis*,[4] and perhaps his office remained unaffected by the enactments regarding this sphere of the Master's duties subsequent to the death of Anthemius, although in other respects his jurisdiction in the Ostrogothic Kingdom probably was the same as that of the Master in the Orient.[5]

Indeed, since the organization of the court and the administration of Theoderic was thoroughly Roman in character — for the Romans the Empire might still be said to be in existence in the West — it is not surprising to find the officials at the Ostrogothic court in Ravenna holding the same titles and exercising the same functions as those who formerly officiated under the Roman Emperors in the West and were still functioning in the

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 35, 18 (492).

[2] *Codex Justinianus*, VII, 62, 37 (529).

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, III, 24, 3, par. 2: *quotiens tamen ad eius judicium specialis nostrae pietatis emanaverit jussio.*

[4] Mommsen, *Aetius*, in *Hermes*, vol. XXXVI, pp. 537 ff.

[5] To be inferred from Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6.

Digitized by Google

East.[1] Thus we see that the Master of the Offices under Theoderic holds a position almost identical with that of the officials bearing the same name at the courts of Anastasius, Justin, and Justinian.[2]

Only in a few points has the sphere of the Master's activities undergone any change. The control of the arsenals and their employees in Italy had been restored to the office of the Pretorian Prefect,[3] perhaps with the object of obtaining more efficient control by a better concentration of authority. To offset this loss of power the Master of the Offices might point to an extension of his authority in regard to the State Post, of which the maintenance, as well as the use, was under his supervision in the West.[4] Further, the Master of the Offices under the Ostrogoths had the power to appoint at his discretion *peraequatores victualium* for Ravenna.[5] These were officers whose duty it was to fix the price for articles of consumption offered for sale in the city.[6] The Master likewise named a judge to settle disputes arising in connection with their activities.[7] It seems probable that this phase of municipal administration was placed in the hands of the Master because at Ravenna there were no officials corresponding to the *praefecti annonae*, or even the Urban Prefects, of Rome and Constantinople, who would have had such matters under their care. Furthermore, when the seat of the Mastership, along with the centre of the administration, was transferred from Rome to Ravenna, the Master of the Offices at times appointed a deputy with the title of *vices agens* to represent him in Rome.[8] Such an official is attested for the year 533.[9]

From this historical survey it will be clear that the office of *magister officiorum* remained essentially the same in character

[1] Cassiodorus, *Var., passim;* Mommsen, *Ostgothische Studien*, *Neues Archiv*, vol. 14. 1899; Dumoulin, *Cambridge Mediæval History*, vol. 1, pp. 441–5. Cf. *Anonymus Valesii*, 60: (*Theodoricus*) *militiam Romanis sicut sub principes esse praecepit.*

[2] Casssiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 7, 18, 19.

[4] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6, 3; 5, 5.

[5] *Op. cit.*, 6, 6: *Peraequatores victualium rerum in urbe regia propria voluntate constituit.*

[6] Defined by DuCange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis: qui rebus venalibus pretium indunt ac indicunt.*

[7] Cassiodorus, *loc. cit.: et tam necessariae rei iudicem facit. Ipse enim gaudium populi, ipse nostris temporibus praestet ornatum quando tales viros copiae publicae praeficit, ut plebs querula seditionem nesciat habere satiata.*

[8] Mommsen, *Neues Archiv*, vol. XIV, p. 463.

[9] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 11, 4; 11, 5; 12, 25.

Digitized by Google

from Constantine to Justinian, although its sphere of administrative duties was slightly enlarged and it acquired new powers in the exercise of judicial functions. The Master of the Offices likewise maintained his rank among the *dignitates palatinae* and the other high officials of the empire. This will be apparent from a consideration of the several classes of dignitaries to which the Master was successively admitted. And in this connection there should be borne in mind the dominant tendency in the organization of the hierarchy of rank of the Later Empire. This was to extend previously established grades of rank to include ever wider circles of officials and thus depreciate their worth, while, in compensation, new and more exclusive classes with fresh titles of rank were created for the higher offices.

The Master of the Offices as one of the *comites consistoriani*, or standing members of the imperial *consistorium*,[1] was a *comes primi ordinis*[2] and consequently authorized to bear the title of *comes*, so that his full official designation was, as we have seen, *comes et magister officiorum*. This form appears frequently in imperial constitutions and elsewhere throughout the fourth and the greater part of the fifth century.[3] However, as the word *comes* was merely a personal designation of rank and did not form an integral part of the Master's official title, as came to be the case with the *comes sacrarum largitionum*, and because the holder of the Mastership was *ipso facto* a *comes*, the *comitiva* was frequently ignored, even in official documents.[4] This neglect of the *comitiva* extended to all similar offices, and became more frequent as that dignity was rapidly extended to officials of very low rank; and, finally, to practically all who were exempt from the municipal *munera*, although it long continued in vogue for high military officials in the West.[5] From the last quarter of the fifth century it is no longer found among the titles of the Master of the Offices.

It is probable that the first of the graded classes of the digni-

[1] Ammianus, 15, 5, 12; *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 30, 1, and 4; VII, 8, 3, cf. VI, 9, 1; and IX, 14, 3; Cassiodorus, *Var.*, 6, 6, 2; Mommsen, *Neues Archiv*, vol. 14, p. 445; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 645.

[2] Dessau, *Inscr. Select.*, 1244; Mommsen, *loc. cit.*; Seeck, *loc. cit.*

[3] The earliest instance of this full title is *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 8, (357); the latest, *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 55, 4 (474).

[4] Thus Hilarianus appears as *comes et magister* in *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 10 (470) and XII, 55, 4 (474), but as *magister* only in I. 23, 6 (470) and XII, 59, 9 (id?); Mommsen, *Neues Archiv*, vol. 14, pp. 510 f.

[5] Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, pp. 635–6.

Digitized by Google

taries to which the Master belonged was the Perfectissimate, which in the early years of the reign of Constantine I still included civil officials of high rank. At least a *comes*, evidently in charge of the administration of the *res privata*, was a *perfectissimus* in 319,[1] and, as we shall see, the Master of the Offices, although taking precedence over the Counts of the financial administration, regularly belonged to the same order of rank. However, when the equestrian career was abolished, presumably after the defeat of Licinius in 323, the Perfectissimate was conferred upon lower grades of officials, and the Clarissimate was for a long time the sole order of rank for the highest officers.[2] Consequently the Master became a *vir clarissimus*.[3] In 372, the Master of the Offices, along with the Quaestor and the Counts of the Sacred Largesses and the Privy Purse, was given precedence over the proconsuls,[4] evidently because of the increasing importance of these *comites consistoriani*, owing to their close proximity to the Emperor. By 378 the Master had become a *vir spectabilis*,[5] and not long afterwards, by 385 at the latest,[6] had attained the highest of the orders of rank existing at that time, the Illustrissimate, to which the other *comites consistoriani* were admitted at about the same time.[7]

Shortly before this, in 380, a constitution of Gratian and Theodosius granted to the ex-Masters, together with the ex-Quaestors and the ex-Counts of the Sacred Largesses and the Privy Purse, the same honorable reception on official occasions that the ex-Prefects enjoyed.[8]

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, X, 8, 2; *virum perfectissimum comitem et amicum nostrum*. The Nemesianus, *v. p. com. larg.* of XI, 7, 5 (345), is a subordinate official, and not the chief of the *sacrae largitiones*. Hirschfeld, *Die Ranktitel der römischen Kaiserzeit, Sitzungsbericht der Berliner Akad.*, 1901, p. 593; Mommsen u. Meyer, *Codex Theodosianus*, vol. 1, pp. CLXXXVIII, CCII.

[2] Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, 588, 593.

[3] The earliest instance of a Master with this title is in 357, *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 8; but references to *magistri officiorum* prior to 350 are very rare and the first constitution addressed to one dates from 362 (*Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 39, 5).

[4] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 9, 1; *Eorum honores, qui sacrario n(os)tro explorata sedulitate oboediunt, hac volumus o(bser)vatione distingui, ut quaestor atque officiorum m(agis)ter nec non duo largitionum comites proconsula(rium) honoribus praeferantur.*

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 35: *spectabilis viri officiorum magistri.*

[6] Symmachus, *Relationes*, 34, 8; 38, 4; 43, 2.

[7] Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 599 f., who rightly refuses to accept *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 9, 2 as implying that these officials were *viri illustres* in 380. The attribution of *illustris* to a Master in *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 22 (365) is certainly an error.

[8] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 9, 2: *Qui exquaesturae honore aut efficaci magis(te)rio aut comitiva utriusque aerarii nostri attonito sp(len)dore viguerunt, adclamatione*

Digitized by Google

Whenever the Master of the Offices is given the combined title of *vir clarissimus et illustris*,[1] the *clarissimus* is to be regarded as the general title of rank of the senatorial order to which the bearer belonged, while the *illustris* denotes the special grade of rank conferred by the particular office, the Mastership.[2]

Within the order of the Illustrissimate there were several grades. Of these the first was composed of the Prefects, the Magistri Militum and the Grand Chamberlain; the second comprised the Master of the Offices and the other *comites consistoriani*.[3] Under Valentinian III and Marcian (450–55) the Master of the Offices and the Quaestor seem to have formed a second class of *illustres* by themselves, while the Counts of the Treasury made up a third grade.[4] However, under Zeno[5] (474–91) and Anastasius[6] (491–518) the latter were again in the same class as the Master. In another constitution of Zeno a Master was designated as *excellentissimus*,[7] and before the middle of the fifth century the title *magnificus*[8] began to be applied to the holders of this office. However, these new titles do not imply new orders of rank, for *excellentissimus* was applied quite generally to the highest officials without special reference to a grade of dignity, and *magnificus* was only used of *illustres*, either alone or in the *illustris et magnificus*.[9]

In 535 the Master of the Offices appears as a member of the recently established order of the *gloriosissimi*, a higher rank than the *illustres*, along with the Prefects, Magistri Militum, Quaestor, and Grand Chamberlain.[10] This was the last and highest grade of dignitaries created before the Byzantine period. At this time also the adjective *sacer* was employed with greater frequency to

excipiantur solita, n(ec) praetereantur ut incogniti atque, ut non aequand(i) (il)lis, qui gesserint praefecturas, sed eo observentur c(ul)tu omni coetu omnique conventu.

[1] Symmachus, *Relationes*, [10], 34; 34, 8; 38, 4; 43, 2.

[2] Koch, *Die byzantinischen Beamtentitel von 400 bis 700*, p. 12.

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 7, 8; VI, 8, 1; VI, 9, 1; Jullian, Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*, vol. 3, p. 385 f.

[4] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 40, 10.

[5] *Op. cit.*, X, 32, 64.

[6] *Op. cit.*, X, 32, 66 (497–499).

[7] *Op. cit.*, XII, 16, 4.

[8] *Novellae Theodosii*, 6, (438), *viri inlustris atque magnifici magistri officiorum*; *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 20, 4: (Leo) *viri magnifici magistri officiorum*; *op. cit.* III, 24, 3 (485–86), *viri magnifici*.

[9] Cf. Koch, *Byzantinische Beamtentitel*, 43, 51.

[10] *Novellae Justiniani*, 2, (535); 14. *fin.* (535); *Edictum Justiniani*, 8, 1 (548); Jullian, Daremberg et Saglio, vol. 3, p. 388; Koch, *op. cit.*, pp. 43, 65.

Digitized by Google

designate persons or things immediately connected with the Emperor; a usage that applied to the officia of the palace. Hence the full title of the Master of the Offices was *gloriosissimus magister sacrorum officiorum*, in Greek, ἐνδοξότατος μάγιστρος τῶν θειῶν ὀφφικίων.[1]

Moreover, the Masters of the Offices, who were actually exercising, or had exercised, the functions of this office, like the Consuls, Prefects, and Magistri Militum, might receive the patriciate, the most coveted honorary title of the Empire.[2]

The order of precedence among the great ministers of the Empire, as established in the course of the fourth century, is preserved in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, and was maintained with but little alteration while these offices themselves endured. Naturally those offices forming the higher took precedence over those forming the lower grades of rank. Thus in the *Notitia* the Master of the Offices is ranked below the Prefects, the Magistri Militum, and the Grand Chamberlain, yet he is placed above others in the same grade as himself, namely the Quaestor and the Counts of the Sacred Largesses and the Privy Purse.[3] However, there was practically no distinction in the ranking of the Master and the Quaestor, as will be seen at once from the way in which now one and now the other took precedence.[4] In the constitutions of 362,[5] 372,[6] and 380[7] the Quaestor is given the priority, but in others of 409[8] and 415[9] this order is reversed. However, in 416[10] the Quaestor again takes precedence; and, although in the *Notitia* he stands below the Master, he retains this precedence at the time of the compilation of the Theodosian Code (438).[11] The

[1] *Novellae Justiniani*, 2 (535); 85 (539); *Edictum Justiniani*, 8, 1 (548).

[2] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 3, 3: *Nemini ad sublimen patriciatus honorem, qui ceteris omnibus anteponitur, adscendere liceat, nisi prius aut consulatus honore potiatur aut praefecturae praetorio vel Illyrici vel urbis administrationem aut magistri militum aut magistri officiorum, in actu videlicet positus, gessisse noscatur, ut huiusmodi tantum personis sive adhuc administrationem gerendo seu postea liceat (quando hoc nostrae sederit maiestati) patriciam consequi dignitatem* (Zeno); an example is Hermogenes, *magister sacrorum officiorum et patricius*, *Novellae Justiniani*, 10 (535).

[3] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* 1, *occ.* 1; Hirschfeld, *Ranktitel der römischen Kaiserzeit*, p. 599, thinks that the high position of the Grand Chamberlain was due to the influence of Eutropius, who held that post under Arcadius.

[4] Cf. Mommsen, *Neues Archiv*, vol. 14, p. 454.

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 39, 5.

[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 9, 1.

[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 9, 2 = *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 6, 1.

[8] *Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 18, 1.

[9] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 8, 1.

[10] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 26, 17.

[11] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, *tit.* 18, 9; cf. VI, 9 rubric = *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 6.

Digitized by Google

same situation prevails in 440–41,[1] but in 485–86[2] the Master has the seniority. In the West under Theoderic both Eugenites[3] and Cassiodorus[4] were promoted from the Quaestorship to the Mastership, but yet in his *Formulae* Cassiodorus gives the precedence to the former office.[5] In the East under Justinian, Trebonian held both offices at once[6] and under Justinus II Anastasius had the same twofold powers.[7]

The examples cited show how slight was the distinction in rank between the two offices in question. Seeck[8] has sought to prove that at the beginning of the fifth century there was a definite period during which the Master took precedence over his fellow-official, but Mommsen[9] has pointed out that the evidence does not support his contention. However, from the fact that, as has been noticed, the Mastership and not the Quaestorship qualified its holder for the patrician dignity,[10] we may conclude that towards the end of the fifth century the former had come to be regarded as the more honorable office. This view is supported by the mention, in Justinian's Edict of 548, of the Mastership immediately after the Prefecture and before the *magisterium militum*,[11] although there is no proof that it had permanently gained precedence over the latter. On the other hand, both the Master and the Quaestor now ranked above the Grand Chamberlain,[12] who in the *Notitia* stood next to the Magistri Militum.

The Master of the Offices, as *clarissimus*, *spectabilis* or *illustris*, was of senatorial rank, but it was only after the expiration of his term of office that he took his place as a member of that order.[13]

And so, at the middle of the sixth century, the Master of the Offices not only held one of the most influential positions in the imperial administration, but also in rank was one of the highest dignitaries of Roman officialdom.

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 8, 2.
[2] *Codex Justinianus*, III, 24, 3; so also XII, 40, 10 (450–5).
[3] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 1, 12; 13.
[4] *Op. cit.*, 9, 24.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 6, 5; 6.
[6] *Novellae Justiniani*, 33: *illustris magister officiorum et quaestor sacri palatii* (536).
[7] Corripus, *Panegyr. in Justinum, pr.: gemino honore quaestor et magister.*
[8] *Quaestiones de notitia dignitatum*, p. 12.
[9] *Neues Archiv*, vol. 14, p. 464.
[10] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 3, 3.
[11] *Edictum Justiniani*, 8, 1.
[12] *Codex Justinianus*, III, 24, 3 (485–6).
[13] Id., *qui magistri officiorum vel quaestoris officio functus aut sacri nostrae pietatis cubiculi praepositus post depositam administrationem senatorio ordini sociatus est*; cf. Lécrivain, *Le sénat romain*, p. 63.

Digitized by Google

III. The Mastership in the Byzantine Empire to the Latin Conquest, in 1204 A.D.

Granted that the division of history into periods is an arbitrary convention and that there is an unbroken line of continuity in the constitutional development of the Roman Empire from Augustus until the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 A.D., and perhaps even longer, it must nevertheless be acknowledged that the period between the death of Justinian (565) and the accession of Heraclius (610) wrought changes of such importance in the Roman Empire of the East that afterwards it bore a decidedly new character. This fact will justify the use of the term Byzantine to designate that period of its history which extends from the revival following the collapse of the Justinian organization to the final dissolution of the Empire.[1]

Partly responsible for the altered tone of the new epoch was the loss of almost all the Latin-speaking provinces, which earlier had been under the imperial authority, and the consequent overwhelming preponderance of the Greek element in the Empire. As a result of this, Latin by the end of the sixth century had ceased to be the official imperial language;[2] and although the citizens of the Empire continued to be called *Romaioi*, this title had lost its original significance.[3]

The change in the official language brought about a corresponding change in the titles of the offices of state which had been created while Latin was yet the imperial tongue, and which, consequently, had Latin names. These titles had now to be expressed in Greek. For this purpose a Greek word, which in significance corresponded to the original Latin title, was often employed. Frequently, however, when such an equivalent was not ready to hand, the Latin form was simply written in Greek characters. Thus, while the Prefect was henceforth ὁ ἔπαρχος, the Master of the Offices became ὁ μάγιστρος τῶν βασιλικῶν ὀφφικίων[4]; or, more simply, ὁ μάγιστρος, '*the* master,' since the

[1] Gelzer, *Abriss der byzantinischen Kaisergeschichte*, in Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. IX, 1, pp. 909, 946; Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2, pp. 67–68; Baynes, *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, vol. 2, p. 263; Pernice, *L'imperatore Eraclio*, p. 222.

[2] Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2, p. 166.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 171.

[4] Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum collectio*, vol. XI, pp. 209, 217.

Digitized by Google

titles of the other *magistri* were not merely transliterated, but translated, in the new official terminology.

Moreover, not only were the titles of officials altered in this way, but the administrative system itself was fundamentally changed. The older system, with its small group of "great ministers," who were directly responsible to the Emperor and under whom the other administrative officers were ranged in a system of graded subordination," was definitely abandoned under the Heraclid dynasty in the seventh century. In its place arose a new order, perfected by the ninth century, in which there was practically no hierarchy of office, only one of rank; in which, moreover, the administration was entrusted to some sixty officials, each of whom was directly responsible to the sovereign. This change had been made possible by the great diminution of the territorial extent of the Empire, and had been carried out, (1) by a reorganization of the provincial administration, whereby the older dioceses and provinces gave place to new units of organization called *themes* — a change which was accompanied by the disappearance of the *magistri militum* and the Pretorian Prefects; and (2), by the breaking up of the great central ministries into the various departments of which they had been composed, so that each of these now became an independent office.[1]

For a time, however, the Master of the Offices remained unaffected by these changes; he appears with unaltered title, and apparently in the full enjoyment of his former powers, as late as the reign of Constantine IV (668–85).[2] But before the end of the reign of Leo III, the Isaurian (717–40), the greater part of the administrative functions of the Master had been transferred to several officials, some of whom had once been subordinates of the Master but had later been given an independent sphere of administration.[3] The chief of those among whom the functions of the Master were divided were the Logothete of the Post (λογοθέτης τοῦ δρομοῦ), the Domesticus of the Guard (δομεστικὸς τῶν σχολῶν), the Quaestor, the Secretary of Petitions, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων, and the Master of Ceremonies, ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως.

The office of the Logothete of the Post originated in that of

[1] Bury, *Imperial Administration in the Ninth Century, British Academy Supplementary Papers*, I (1911), pp. 19–20.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 91, where there is a list of references to Masters of the seventh century.

[3] Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 32. Bury also (pp. 29–31) gives a list of the known instances of the occurrence of the title *magistros* from 718–9 to 886–8 A.D.

Digitized by Google

the *curiosus cursus publici praesentalis*, a member of the Master's *officium*, who first acquired the title of Logothete in the eighth century. This official now took charge of the State Post, and, with it, of the diplomatic duties which the Master had exercised, such as the correspondence with foreign powers and the reception of ambassadors.[1]

The Domesticus of the Guard probably developed from the *domesticus* who appears earlier in the service of the Master of the Offices.[2] The title δομεστικὸς τῶν σχολῶν appears as early as 759,[3] and its bearer may possibly have been in command of the Scholarians, as the subordinate of the Master of the Offices, by 624.[4] However, in the eighth century the Domesticus was the chief in command of these guards, free from any subordination to the Master.

The Quaestor, to some extent at least, had always controlled the activities of the *scrinia*. It is not surprising therefore to find that when the Master of the Offices ceased to supervise the Secretaries, ἀντιγραφεῖς, who were the *magister epistolarum* and *magister libellorum* in Greek guise,[5] these should have been finally placed under the Quaestor alone.[6]

The Secretary for Petitions, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων, however, who was formerly the *magister memoriae*, the highest in rank among the Masters of the *scrinia*, had had his charge raised to the dignity of an independent administrative bureau.[7]

Finally, the Master of Ceremonies, ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως, whose function is defined by his title and whose office seems to have originated in that of the *comes* (once *magister*) *dispositionum*, chief of the *scrinium dispositionum* and a subordinate of the Master of the Offices,[8] likewise had been freed from the control of a superior official and had acquired the direction of the court ushers (*officium admissionum*), who had been at one time also *sub dispositione magistri officiorum*.[9] Possibly the functions involv-

[1] Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

[2] Ammianus, 30, 2, 10–11 (374). Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 50, thinks that the *domesticus* was possibly the same as the *adjutor* who was at the head of the Master's *officium* (*Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 41; *occ.* IX, 41). This may ultimately have been the case, but originally the two offices were quite distinct; cf. Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 5, pp. 1296 ff.

[3] Theophanes, 684.

[4] *Chronicon Paschale*; Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

[5] Bury, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXI, pp. 23–9; *Imperial Administration*, pp. 74–5.

[6] Bury, *Imperial Administration*, p. 76.

[7] *Op. cit.*, pp. 76–7.

[8] Cf. *Harvard Studies*, vol. XXVI, p. 99 f.

[9] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 16, 17; Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 118–19.

Digitized by Google

ing the supervision of the court ceremonial were among those which remained longest with the Master of the Offices.

Nevertheless, although the *magistros* of the eighth century, without administrative and judicial functions, presents such a different appearance from the *magister officiorum* of the sixth, this is not due to the creation of a new Mastership but to the radical changes which have altered the character of the old office. This Bury[1] has proved by pointing out that, first, the *magistri militum* and the *magistri scriniorum* did not have the title *magistros* in Greek, while the Master of the Offices of earlier times appears in Theophanes usually simply as ὁ μάγιστρος; secondly, the part which the Master plays in the eighth century is that of the Master of the Offices in his rôle of "Master of Ceremonies"; thirdly, in the court functions described in the *de caeremoniis*,[2] and dating from an earlier period, the *magistros* acts as a Master of Ceremonies, which fact seems to supply the link between the Master of the Offices of the seventh and the Master of the eighth century; and fourthly, in the old ceremonial at the appointment of a Master,[3] the latter was placed "at the head of the σέκρετον," which seems to imply that he held the highest rank at the imperial audiences. This ceremony dates from the time when there was only one Master, whose position thus seems to accord with that of the earlier official of the same name. Finally, in the Novels of Leo VI (886–912), Stylianos, father-in-law and minister of that Emperor, is expressly called Master of the Offices.[4]

However, in the eighth century this Master, whose title regularly lacked the addition τῶν ὀφφικίων, since he had lost control of the *officia* of the palace, was also known as the First Master ὁ πρῶτος μάγιστρος.[5] This usage implies that at that time there was more than one Master at the Byzantine court, and indeed, such was the case. For there had appeared a second Master, whose presence is first clearly noticed in the account of the elevation of the sons of Constantine V to the rank of Caesar in 768 A.D.,[6] where Magistri are mentioned in the plural and form a rank (*velum*, βῆλον) distinct from the Patricians. Of these Masters

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 30–1.

[2] *De Caer.*, I, 68, 70.

[3] *De Caer.*, I, 46, 233: καὶ ἵστησιν αὐτὸν ὁ πραιπόσιτος εἰς κεφαλὴν τοῦ σεκρέτου ἐπάνω πάντων τῶν πατρικίων. Σέκρετον corresponds to the older *consistorium*.

[4] Στυλιανῷ τῷ περιφανεστάτῳ (or ὑπερφνεστάτῳ) μαγίστρῳ τῶν θείων ὀφφικίων (*Nov.* I, 18, etc. Cf. Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 31).

[5] *De Caer.*, I, 43, 224.

[6] *De Caer.*, I, 43.

Digitized by Google

the one who was called ὁ μάγιστρος,[1] or ὁ πρῶτος μάγιστρος,[2] had a more elevated position than his associate.

The reason for the establishment of a second Mastership, according to Bury,[3] may possibly be found in the imperial absences from the capital. The presence of the original Master was required, as we shall see, in the city, and as the Emperor probably desired to have a Master in his moving court a second Master was appointed. Originally, this latter position may not have been a permanent office, but one created for special occasions only. Later, however, the two Masters were in office at the same time. The second Master, Bury[4] would identify with the μάγιστρος ἐκ προσώπου mentioned by Theophanes in connection with the rebellion of Artavasdos in 741.[5] However, I am inclined to think that this is an erroneous conclusion. Bury clearly intimates that it was the second Master who accompanied the Emperor during his absences from the city. But the term ἐκ προσώπου, which corresponds to the Latin *vices agens*, implies that the Master thus described was the deputy of the Emperor, and, therefore, the one left in Constantinople to direct affairs there. This duty, as we shall see, was later performed by the official known as ὁ μάγιστρος. And, as a matter of fact, Theophanes, μάγιστρος ἐκ προσώπου in 741, had been left in the capital when the Emperor Constantine V went to Asia.[6] Consequently, we must conclude that ἐκ προσώπου was a term applied to the First Master, who acted as a sort of Viceroy, or that it was the First Master who accompanied the Emperor, while the other remained in the city, a conclusion which would conflict with the custom of the following century.[7]

In the eighth century the Mastership was no longer an annual office but was conferred for life upon holders of the patrician dignity.[8] But it had not yet become a mere title of rank, for it involved the performance of certain duties. The Master who was at the head of σέκρετον,[9] *i. e.*, the πρωτομάγιστρος, was the leading

[1] *De Caer.*, 219, 9; 220, 4.

[2] *De Caer.*, 224, 5–13. This appears as πρωτομάγιστρος in Philotheos, 781, 11.

[3] *Imperial Administration*, p. 32. [4] *Op. cit., loc. cit.*

[5] Theophanes, 639, 3. For the chronology, cf. Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2, pp. 425, 451. Bury here makes the Master in question a *magister militum in praesenti*, but in his *Imperial Administration* he has apparently abandoned this interpretation as incorrect.

[6] Theophanes, 639: Ἀρταβάδος δὲ γράφει πρὸς Θεοφάνην τὸν πατρίκιον καὶ μάγιστρον ἐκπροσώπω ὄντα ἐν τῇ πόλει. [7] Περὶ τάξεων, 504, 506](831 A.D.). [8] *De Caer.*, 1, 46, 235.

[9] *De Caer.*, 233, 13; cf. Genesius, 83, 17: ὁ πρῶτα φέρων Μανουὴλ ἐν μαγίστροις (under Theophilus).

Digitized by Google

member of the senate.[1] During the absence of the Emperor from the capital, as late as the ninth century he shared in the direction of the government with the Chamberlain and the Urban Prefect, as we learn from the document called *περὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν ταξειδίων*.[2] Upon such occasions the administration was entrusted to a committee of three, of whom the Chamberlain acted as the representative or vicar of the Emperor (ὁ διέπων), officiating wherever the presence of the latter or his *alter ego* was necessary, while the Master and the Prefect supervised the administration in general. At this time it was the Chamberlain who held the Emperor's power *ἐκ προσώπου*, as the Master had done in the previous century.

This arrangement, usual in the ninth century, had apparently been discarded in the tenth, since it is described as *τὸ παλαιὸν ἔθος* in the work just referred to. Recollecting the ceremonial duties of this Master, which have been noted previously, we may say that the position which he held was more honorable, although less onerous, than that of the earlier Master of the Offices.

The second Master shared in the ceremonial duties of the first, as is evidenced in the account of the ceremonial at the creation of a Patrician, probably dating from the time of Michael III (842–67),[3] and when the Emperor made offerings in St. Sophia,[4] he also had administrative duties to perform.[5] This additional Mastership was created before 768,[6] and its establishment, as has been noted, was the cause of the employment of the title *πρῶτος μάγιστρος* to designate the senior office.

The number of Masters continued to be limited to two during

[1] Theodore of Studion, *Epistulæ*, 76 (A.D. 821?): *τῆς συγκλήτου πρωτόβαθρον*.

[2] Appendix to *De Caer.*, 1 (Bekker), 504, 4: *ἐξῆλθεν ἡ Αὐγούστα ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ὁ διέπων σὺν τῷ μαγίστρῳ καὶ τῷ ἐπάρχῳ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει σύγκλητος ἅπασα*; 506, 1; *ὁ μάγιστρος καὶ ὁ διέπων καὶ ὁ ἔπαρχος τῆς πολέως*, 831 A. D.; 503, 6; *ὁ τοίνυν ἐναπομείνας μετὰ τοῦ μαγίστρου καὶ τοῦ ἐπάρχου, ὁ καὶ διέπων τὴν ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ βασιλέως δουλείας ἀρχὴν Βαάνης ἦν, ὁ πατρίκιος πραιπόσιτος καὶ σακελλάριος, καθὼς τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκράτει τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἔθος, ἐξερχομένου τοῦ βασιλεως ἐπὶ φοσσάτον τὸν πραιπόσιτον παρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχῆς ἐπικράτειαν, καὶ τῷ μαγίστρῳ καὶ τῷ ἐπάρχῳ τὴν τῆς πολιτείας καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τὴν διοίκησιν*; at the time of the expedition of Basil I against Tephrike, 871. On the title of this work, cf. Bury, *English Historical Review*, 1907, p. 439.

[3] *De Caer.*, 1, 48, 245, 17–20; 248, 16, 21, 24; 249, 7; Bury, *Imperial Administration*, p. 31.

[4] *De Caer.*, 2, 31.

[5] Theophanes Continuatus, 347, see below This passage does not refer to ceremonial duties; cf. Bury, *Imperial Administration*, p. 31.

[6] *De Caer.*, 1, 43, see above.

Digitized by Google

the rest of the eighth and the first decades of the ninth century.[1] But in the reign of Michael III (842–67), their number seems to have been increased. For a time, indeed, even under this Emperor, they were apparently still restricted to two,[2] but it is possible to trace at least three, and possibly six Masters appointed by him.[3] These, with the Manuel who was Master after 842,[4] make a total of seven during this reign, more than two of whom certainly held the title of Master at the same time. Furthermore, in one of the ceremonies dating from this epoch, Masters are mentioned in such a way as to point unmistakably to the possibility of creating several at once.[5] For these reasons we may conclude that it was Michael III who first transformed the Mastership into an order of rank like the patrician dignity;[6] whereas the honorary Master of the Roman period had been *illustris*, with the specific title of *magister officiorum*.

This conversion of the Mastership into an order of rank is to be connected with the creation of the class of the *ἀνθύπατοι*, higher than that of the Patricians, likewise effected under Michael III;[7] the change marks important innovations in the grades of dignities made by that Emperor. Of these Masters two, the successors of the earlier pair, apparently continued to have official duties. Under Basil I, successor of Michael III, these were known as "the two Masters of State" and were entrusted with the execution of extraordinary missions.[8] One of them also, as we have seen, shared in the direction of the administration during the absence of the Emperor from Constantinople.[9] Stylianos, father-in-law of Leo VI, who appears under the title of *μάγιστρος τῶν θείων ὀφφικίων*,[10] was one of these Masters, enjoying the old title of the Mastership, and, at the same time, the senior in rank of all the Masters,

[1] Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 29 ff., with a list of the references to Masters of these centuries. Also Philotheos, 727, 3: *ὁ μάγιστρος, ὁ μάγιστρος*. Cf. Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[2] *De Caer.*, 2, 31: *ἀναμεταξὺ τῶν δύο μαγίστρων*.

[3] Certain are Petronas, Genesius, 97, 8: Basil, Genesius, 111, 19: and Leo Theodatakes, Nicetas, *vita Ignatii*, in Mansi, vol. XVI, p. 237. Possible are Arsaber, Theophanes Continuatus, 175; and Stephen and Bardas, *ibid.*

[4] Theophanes Continuatus, 148, 13,

[5] *De Caer.*, 1, 26, 143: *εἰ μὲν κελεύει ὁ βασιλεὺς ποιῆσαι μαγίστρους*, etc.; cf. Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[6] In the ceremonies of the time of Michael III the Masters appear as an order like the Patricians; cf. Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[7] Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[8] Theophanes Continuatus, 347, 6: *τοῖς δυσὶ τῆς πολιτείας μαγίστροις*, 347, 20, *παραιτοῦνται δὲ τὴν ὑπουργίαν καὶ οἱ λαμπρότατοι μάγιστροι*.

[9] *περὶ τάξεων*, 503, 6.

[10] *Novellae Leonis*, VI. 1, 18, etc.

Digitized by Google

as is indicated by application to him of πρωτομάγιστρος,[1] which here has the same connotation as πρωτοπατρίκιος.[2]

For the early years of the reign of Constantine VII (912–58) we know of four Masters,[3] and of five in the later period of the same Emperor's rule, all of them apparently in enjoyment of this rank at the same time.[4] Still, the total number of Masters at this epoch seems to have been less than twelve, for there were not enough of them to wear the twelve golden λῶροι at one of the ceremonies dating from this period,[5] and some of the ἀνθύπατοι had to be associated with them for this purpose. Luitprand[6] says that there were twenty-four Masters in Constantinople during his visit there in 968, but that seems an almost incredible number and his report arouses suspicion.[7]

In the tenth century there is no further evidence that any of these Masters, as such, performed active administrative duties. However, the Mastership was regularly conferred upon holders of important offices, such as Leo and Bardas Phokas, who were δομεστικοὶ σχολῶν,[8] and Romanos Saronites and Romanos Mousele, who seem to have been Strategoi.[9] Those honored with the Mastership are found, indeed, playing an active part in the administrative and military spheres, but this is due to the various offices or the special authority which they held in addition to the Mastership, and not because the title of Master involved any special services of this nature, or qualified its holder for them. It was therefore purely a dignity, and no longer an office.

Among the eighteen titles of honor conferred by the Byzantine Emperors at the close of the ninth century that of Master ranked fourteenth in the ascending order, and the Masters formed the highest class of dignitaries; the more honorable titles of Zōstē Patricia, Curopalates, Nobelissimus, and Caesar were rarely conferred upon more than one individual at the same time; in the case of the last, three at least, were usually reserved for

[1] *Vita Euthymii*, 3, 6.

[2] Theophanes, 380, 291; cf. Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[3] Theophanes Continuatus, 380, 381, 385, 388, 390; Stephanos, Johannes Eladas, Leo Phokas; 413, and 417, Nicetas.

[4] Theophanes Continuatus, 436, 459, Bardas Phokas; 443, Johannes Kurkuas, Kosmas, Romanos Saronites, Romanos Mousele.

[5] *De Caer.*, 1, 24.

[6] *Antapodosis*, 6, 10.

[7] So, too, with Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[8] Theophanes Continuatus, 388: 436.

[9] Theophanes Continuatus, 443; Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

Digitized by Google

members of the imperial family.[1] This remained the status of the Masters so far as we can trace the existence of this dignity.

By the tenth century the Mastership had become an hereditary dignity in certain princely families who were vassals of the Byzantine Empire. Such were the families of the princes of Armenia[2] and of Taran or Daran.[3] Says Rombaud,[4] "the court of Byzantium distributed the brevets of its court dignities in the valley of the Caucasus and Armenia, as later the court of St. Petersburg has distributed the cordons of its orders." This was a species of diplomatic flattery, destined to secure the loyalty of the local chieftains to the Byzantine throne. The title of Master, however, was only conferred upon sovereign princes and members of their families. This conferment of the Mastership was accomplished by the decoration with the Master's robe of rank, as we learn from the procedure in the case of Curcenios the Iberian, who received his title from the Emperor Romanus.[5]

From the ninth and tenth centuries we have the names of the following princes who received the Mastership in this way: Pancratios, Curcenios, a second Pancratios, grandson of the former, and Adranse, princes of Iberia;[6] George, prince of Abasgia;[7] Apasacios, son of Symbatius, prince of Apachume;[8] and Cricoricios or Gregory, prince of Taran.[9]

The same custom was followed in the eleventh century; in this period the title of Master was often conferred upon foreign princes as a reward for their submission to the authority of the Emperor. Among those who received the Mastership for this reason were Prusianos, the Bulgar, in 1017;[10] the son of George, the prince of Abasgia mentioned above, in 1022;[11] Jobanesices, ruler of Anium, under Constantine Monomachos,[12] and Karikios, under the same Emperor.[13]

[1] Philotheos, 708–12; Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–36.

[2] Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin*, p. 532.

[3] *De Caer.*, 1, 24, 138; Schlumberger, *op. cit.*, p. 533; Rombaud, *L'empire grec au dixième siècle*, p. 514.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 513.

[5] Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, 46, 208. Constans, *drungarius* of the fleet, was appointed to bestow the ἱμάτιον μαγιστράτου.

[6] *De adm. imp.*, 46, 206–7.

[7] *De adm. imp.*, 46, 206.

[8] *De adm. imp.*, 44, 191.

[9] *De adm. imp.*, 43, 185.

[10] Cedrenus, II, 469, 24: (Basil II) τοῦτον μὲν μάγιστρον ἐτίμησεν; cf. 483, 6; 487, 12.

[11] Cedrenus, II, 478: ὃν μάγιστρον ποιήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑπέτρεψεν.

[12] Cedrenus, II, 557, 8: ὁ δὲ τῆς συνέσεως τοῦτον ἀποδεξάμενος μάγιστρόν τε τιμᾷ.

[13] Cedrenus, II, 559, 6: ὁ μὲν ἐς τὸν βασιλέα ἐλθὼν καὶ μάγιστρος τιμηθείς.

Digitized by Google

The purely honorary character of the Mastership at this period is clearly shown in the elevation to this dignity in 1028 of a certain Romanos, whom the Emperor Constantine VIII had caused to be deprived of his sight.[1] Nevertheless it was an honor eagerly sought for, to judge from the persistency that Erbebios, or Hervè, the Frankish mercenary in the Byzantine service, displayed in trying to secure it from the Emperor Michael VI (1056–57).[2]

The last notices of the Mastership that I have been able to discover date from the dynasty of the Comnenoi (1081–1185). Anna Comnena mentions an Alan who was a Master under her father, Alexis (1081–1118),[3] while two seals of the Magistrissa Maria,[4] and one of the Magister Christophoros,[5] belong to the late eleventh or early twelfth century. After the restoration of the Byzantine power in the new kingdom of the Paleologoi (1265–1453), the title does not appear among those of the court dignitaries.[6] It is, however, probable that the title continued to be used throughout the period between the death of Alexis Comnenos and the capture of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204.

[1] Cedrenus, II, 487: *ἀνήγαγε δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ λαμπρὸν τῶν μαγίστρων ἀξίωμα . . . Ῥωμανὸν, ὃν ὁ Κονστάντινος . . . ἀπετύφλωσεν.*

[2] Cedrenus, II, 617, 2. Michael refused him, *παρακαλοῦντα γὰρ καὶ ἱκετεύοντα τῆς τῶν μαγίστρων τιμῆς τυχεῖν.*

[3] *Alexias*, 95: *ἠκροᾶτό τις τῶν λεγομένων, Ἄλανας τὸ γένος, μάγιστρος τὴν ἀξίαν.*

[4] Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin*, p. 532, nos. 8 and 9.

[5] Schlumberger, *op. cit.*, p. 463, no. 1.

[6] Codinus, *De officiis*, 7.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV

THE COMPETENCE OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES

AFTER following the history of the Masters of the Offices through eight centuries, from the time of their establishment until their disappearance, the next step is to consider, in somewhat greater detail, the part which they played in the administration of the Empire.

As we have seen, this Office was formed by the association, in the hands of one minister, of various powers which brought under his control most widely separated branches of the administration. Consequently it is not easy to group these various functions and powers into categories. It might be possible to classify them under the heads "administrative" and "judicial," for the reason that the Master's judicial powers were but an outgrowth from, and an adjunct to, his administrative; yet it is not practicable to make such a distinction. We may freely grant that the administrative functions of the Master of the Offices fell into two general groups, according as they were concerned with the organization of the palace or with the governance of the Empire as a whole; nevertheless, the line between these two spheres of action cannot be drawn too sharply, for a great deal of the business of imperial administration was conducted through the *officia palatina*. For example, in the cases of the *scriniarii* and the *agentes in rebus*, it would be difficult to distinguish between the authority which the Master exercised over them as the person responsible for the maintaining of order and discipline among the *officiales* of the court, and the use to which he put them as his agents in fulfilling his duties as an imperial minister. Therefore, it seems most convenient to study the Master's activities so far as possible in connection with the various *officia*, or departments of the administration, over which he, in any respect whatever, exercised control.

Digitized by Google

I. The Master of the Offices and the Palace Guards

The essentially military character of the Mastership of the Offices at the time of its creation has been previously emphasized; and although the military side of his functions was soon overshadowed by the civil, the Master preserved traces of the origin of his office in retaining for a long period the command of the palace guards.

It is probable that the Master of the Offices was in command of the Scholarians from the time when they were instituted by Constantine[1] to take the place of the Pretorian Guard, which he had disbanded after the battle of Saxa Rubra (312).[2] As *tribunus et magister* the Master of the Offices was probably for some time under the orders of the Pretorian Prefect, but with the reorganization of his office and its elevation to the *comitiva* (c. 325), in this respect as elsewhere the Master was subject to none but the Emperor himself.[3]

These new palace guards comprised various corps or *scholae;* they were so called because there was assigned to them a hall, or *schola*, where they were to hold themselves in perpetual readiness for service. They were distinguished from one another by differences in equipment and personnel.[4] At first there were probably five of these corps,[5] but by the opening of the fifth century there were seven in Constantinople and five in Rome.[6] Each of the corps numbered 500 men, so that the total strength of the Scholarians at Rome was 2500, and at Constantinople 3500,[7] until Justinian, when co-Emperor with Justinus, raised the number of those at the Eastern capital by the addition of four new *scholae*, or 2000 men.[8] These latter were called supernumeraries (ὑπερ-

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, XIV, 17, 9; Mommsen, *Hermes*, vol. 24, p. 222.

[2] Zosimus, 2, 17. [3] See above, pp. 29, 32; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 3; 40.

[4] Mommsen, *Hermes*, vol. 24, pp. 222 f. [5] Mommsen, *op. cit.*, 224.

[6] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI: *Scola scutariorum prima, scola scutariorum secunda, scola gentilium seniorum, scola scutariorum sagittariorum, scola scutariorum clibanariorum, scola armaturarum iuniorum, scola gentilium iuniorum; occ.* IX: *scolae scutariorum prima* and *secunda, armaturarum seniorum, gentilium seniorum, scutariorum tertia.*

[7] Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, 24: Ἕτεροι στρατιῶται οὐχ ἧσσους ἢ πεντεκόσιοι καὶ τρισχίλιοι τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ φυλακῇ τοῦ παλατίου κατέστησαν, οὕσπερ σχολαρίους καλοῦσιν; cf. Suidas, s. v. Σχολάριοι.

[8] *Codex Justinianus*, IV, 65, 35: *in undecim devotissimis scholis*; Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, 24: ἡνίκα τοίνυν Ἰουστῖνος τὴν βασιλείαν παρέλαβεν, οὗτος Ἰουστινίανος πολλοὺς εἰς τὴν τιμὴν κατεστήσατο ταύτην, . . . ἐπεὶ δὲ τούτοις καταλόγοις οὐδένα ἐνδεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν ἤσθετο, ἑτέρους αὐτοῖς ἐς δισχιλίους ἐντέθεικεν, οὕσπερ ὑπεραρίθμους ἐκάλουν.

Digitized by Google

ἀριθμοι), and were afterwards disbanded by Justinian himself.[1] However, it may be that the ranks of the Palace Guards were again enlarged, for Lydus[2] gives their strength as ten thousand horse and foot.

The Scholarians were classed as regular soldiers, belonging to the *armata militia*,[3] and had all the privileges of such, but received higher pay than the rest.[4] Hence enrollment in their ranks was an honor highly esteemed and was at first granted only to soldiers who had seen actual service, preferably to Germans[5] and, later, Armenians.[6] However, from the time of Zeno the Isaurian, admission to these scholae was obtained no longer as a reward of merit, but by favor, and finally by open purchase.[7]

This brought about a complete change in the character of the guards, who were now merely an ornamental body, the members of which had secured for themselves an easy berth for life.[8] They had never been called upon to serve outside the capital, and were so utterly unqualified to take the field that, as it is reported, when Justinian threatened to send them on foreign service, they voluntarily secured exemption by a surrender of their pay.[9] At first they had been in a real sense the guards of the palace, being on duty day and night,[10] but Leo seems to have transferred a large share of these actual services to a corps of three hundred *excubi-*

[1] Procopius, *ibid.*

[2] *De Mag.*, 2, 24: *τὸ γὰρ μάγιστρος ὀφφικίων ὄνομα οὐδὲν ἧττον ἡγούμενον τῶν αὐλικῶν καταλόγων σημαίνει, ἐν οἷς ἥ τε ἱππικὴ καὶ ἡ πεξομάχος δύναμις τῆς βασιλείας θεωρεῖται, εἰς μυρίους συναγομένη πολεμιστάς.* This number seems suspiciously large, and lacks confirmation.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, IV, 65, 35: *milites autem appellamus eos, qui tam sub excelsis magistris militum tolerare noscuntur militiam quam in undecim devotissimis scholis*, etc.; Agathias, 5, 15: *οὗτοι δὲ στρατιῶται μὲν ὀνομάζονται, καὶ ἐγγεγράφαται τοῖς τῶν καλόγων βιβλίοις.*

[4] Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, 24; cf. Suidas, *s. v.* Σχολάριοι.

[5] Mommsen, *Hermes*, vol. 24, p. 223.

[6] Agathias, 5, 15; Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, 24: *τούτους οἱ πρότερον μὲν ἀριστίνδην ἀπολέξαντες ἐξ Ἀρμενίων ἐς ταύτην δὴ τὴν τιμὴν ἦγον*; cf. Suidas, *loc. cit.*

[7] *Loc. cit.*

[8] Agathias, 5, 15: *εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ πολλοὶ ἀστικοί τε καὶ φαιδροείμονες, καὶ μόνον, οἶμαι, ὄγκου τοῦ βασιλείου ἕνεκα καὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς προόδοις μεγαλαυχίας ἐξευρημένοι*; Mommsen, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

[9] Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, 24.

[10] Agathias, 5, 15: *ἐκ τῶν ταγμάτων ἐκείνων, οἳ ἐς τὸ διημερεύειν τε καὶ διανυκτερεύειν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἀπεκέκριντο, οὓς δὴ σχολαρίους ἀποκαλοῦσιν*; Procopius, *De Bello Gothico*, 4, 27: *τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ παλατίου φυλακῆς τεταγμένων λόχων, οὕσπερ σχολὰς ὀνομάζουσιν*; *Historia Arcana*, 24; cf. Suidas, *l.c.*; Rutilius Namatianus, *Itinerarium*, I, 563: *Officiis regerem cum regia tecta magister Armigerasque pii principis excubias.*

Digitized by Google

tores, which he created.[1] It was because the Scholarians had thus ceased to be soldiers in the true sense of the word that they were permitted to exist under the command of the Master of the Offices at the Ostrogothic court at Ravenna,[2] although under Theoderic the Romans were excluded from the profession of arms, which became a prerogative of the Gothic conquerors.

As commander of the Scholarians the Master had control over their enrollment,[3] discipline,[4] and promotion.[5] Enrollment in the *scholae* was made by the Master, but only such recruits were received as had been able to secure the imperial sanction in the form of a warrant (*probatoria*), and the Master had to see to the preparation of quarterly lists of the Scholarians, which were to be placed on file so that their *notitia* might be kept up to date and definitely known.[6]

The Master also exercised judicial authority over the Scholarians, their wives or widows, their widowed mothers, their children, in so far as the latter were not under some other judicial authority, and even their slaves, in both civil and criminal cases.[7] The Scholarians, on the other hand, enjoyed exemption from prosecution before any other than the Master's tribunal.[8] This same privilege was accorded in civil cases for the rest of their lives to Scholarians who at the end of their time of service had obtained the rank of *primicerius* and the dignity of *viri clarissimi comites*.[9] However, in criminal cases, or those in which the revenues of state were affected, these latter were subject to the jurisdiction of the provincial governors, that the plea of special privilege

[1] Lydus, *De Mag.*, I, 16: καὶ ὁ Λέων δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς πρῶτος τοὺς λεγομένους ἐκσκουβίτωρας τῶν παρεξόδων τοῦ παλατίου φύλακας προστησάμενος τριακοσίους μόνους ἐστράτευσε; Mommsen, *Hermes*, vol. 24, p. 225.

[2] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6: *ipse insolentium scholarum mores procellos moderationis suae terminis prospere disserenat.*

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 33, 5; I, 31, 5 (527).

[4] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6; *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 29, 1.

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, VII, 1, 14 (394); this can only refer to the Scholarians, as they alone among the *viri militares* were subject to the orders of the Master.

[6] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 5.

[7] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 29, 3 (Zeno): *Quotiens super causa civili vel etiam criminali ex sententia videlicet iudicii tui culminis, scholares vel eorum conjuges, sive adhuc vivent mariti sive post mortem eorum in viduitate constitutae sunt, matresve eorum in viduitate permanentes aut liberi, qui non specialiter alterius iudicis iurisdictioni subiectam conditionem sortiti sunt, et servi ad eos pertinentes conveniuntur.*

[8] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 26, 2 (443-4): *Ad exemplum itaque devotissimorum scholariorum nulli licere memoratos ad aliud iudicium trahere.*

[9] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 29, 2 (474).

Digitized by Google

might not result in danger to the public interest.[1] At all times the Master might delegate his judicial authority over the Scholarians to other officials, such as the judges in the provinces.[2]

Each of the *scholae* had its own commander, at first a *tribunus*, later regularly a *comes*,[3] who was naturally subordinate to the Master of the Offices. Theophanes, for 554 A.D., mentions that in that year the Scholarians mutinied against a *comes* who was in authority over the whole guard.[4] Such an officer would at that time have been a second in command to the Master of the Offices. However, as there is elsewhere no trace whatever of the presence of this *comes*, we are obliged to agree with Bury[5] that Theophanes misunderstood his source and that under the Master were no *comites* except those in command of the separate *scholae*.

By the middle of the eighth century the Master had been relieved of his military authority over the Scholarians; a new commander had been given them, the δομεστικὸς τῶν σχολῶν, whose office had originated in that of the Domesticus of the Master.[6]

II. The Master of the Offices and the *Officia Palatina*

The term *officia palatina*, in its widest sense, covers all persons employed in the various branches of the court service, *qui in sacro palatio militant*.[7] Of these, such as were members of the departments of the Counts of the Sacred Largesses and the Privy Purse were in no way subject to the Master of the Offices.[8]

Among the rest, those who were engaged in rendering menial services about the imperial person, *i.e.* all included under the general name *cubicularii*, were the subordinates of the Grand Chamberlain;[9] while those who performed similar duties in con-

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 29, 2 (474).

[2] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 29, 3, 3: *Quotiens sane apud viros clarissimos provinciarum moderatores, ex delegatione scilicet sententiae tuae magnitudinis, contra viros fortissimos vel eorum coniuges vel liberos vel servos cognitio celebretur.*

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 13, 1 = *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 11, 1: *de comitibus et tribunis scholarum*; *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 29, 1; Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Caer.*, 1, 84.

[4] Theophanes, 366, 3: ἐπανέστησαν αἱ σχολαὶ τῷ κόμητι αὐτῶν.

[5] *Imperial Administration*, p. 50, n. 2.

[6] Theophanes, 684 (767 A.D.); cf. p. 105 below.

[7] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 28, 1; 2. [8] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 23.

[9] In later times Chamberlains, for the Augusta as well as the Augustus, had a *praepositus sacri cubiculi*. *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 5, 5 (Anastasius).

Digitized by Google

nection with the maintenance of the imperial household, *i.e.*, the so-called *castrensiani* and *ministeriani*, were at the disposal of the Castrensis or Steward of the Palace, later known as the Curopalates.[1] In the execution of their duties therefore the *cubicularii* were subject to the orders of the Grand Chamberlain and the *castrensiani* to the Steward, while neither were in this respect under the authority of the Master of the Offices. However, in so far as matters of discipline were concerned, and also in questions relating to the organization of their *officia*, both these classes of *officiales palatini* appear to have come under the Master's supervision.[2] It was for this reason that the Master had judicial authority over them. As we have seen, in the course of the fifth century this jurisdiction became exclusive; the members of these *officia* receiving, like the Scholarians, the privilege of answering all charges in the Master's court alone, to prevent any long interference with the performance of their regular duties which would result from their being haled before outside tribunals. This privilege was also extended in various cases to the families of these *officiales*. Leo and Anthemius decreed that the *cubicularii* of both the Emperor and the Empress should be prosecuted only in the Master's court,[3] and the same rulers bestowed a like privilege upon the members of the *schola sacrae vestis*, their mothers and their wives, in both civil and criminal suits.[4] In 474 this right was extended to the *ministeriani* in general,[5] and later Zeno

[1] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XVII; *occ.* XV. The title *curopalates* gradually supplanted that of *castrensis* in the course of the fifth century; cf. Hartmann, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 3, pp. 1770–1.

[2] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6: *Ad eum nimirum palatii pertinet disciplina*; Rutilius Namatianus, 1, 563: *officiis regerem cum regia tecta magister*; *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 33, 5, where the Master is instructed to prevent the same persons serving in several *officia* or *scrinia*, the duties of which were not closely related; cf. the title *magister officiorum omnium*, Dessau, *Inscriptiones Selectae*, 1244.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 5, 3: *Cubicularios tam sacri cubiculi mei quam venerabilis Augustae, quos utrosque certum est obsequiis occupatos et aulae penetralibus inhaerentes diversa iudicia obire non posse, ab observatione aliorum tribunalium liberamus, ut in sublimitatis solummodo tuae iudicio propositas adversus se excipiant actiones.*

[4] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 25, 3: *Ii qui in schola vestis sacrae militant vel matres eorum vel uxores criminalem vel civilem litem contra se commovendam in nullo alio nisi in sublimitatis tuae suscipiant examine.*

[5] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 25, 4: *Ante omnia nullius penitus alterius iudicis minoris vel maioris sacro ministerio nostro deputatos, quorum officia singillatim brevis subter adnexus continet, nisi a tuae dumtaxat magnitudinis sententiis conveniri, ut in nullo penitus alterius iudicis foro pulsantium nisi in tuae tantummodo amplitudinis examine praebeant aliquando responsum.*

Digitized by Google

forbade the prosecution of a *silentiarius* or his wife on civil or criminal charges before any other judicial authority.[1]

It seems that the *notarii*, or court stenographers and secretaries, whose duties included the keeping of the record of proceedings in the *consistorium* and the care of the *notitia dignitatum et administrationum tam militarium quam civilium*,[2] formed another group of officials whose activities did not fall under the direction of the Master, but whose *matricula* came under his supervision. At least such appears to be the implication of a constitution of Zeno,[3] addressed to a Master of the Offices, containing regulations for the length of service of the *notarii*, their order of seniority, and the honors bestowed on them at the expiration of their term of service.

Further, the *referendarii*, who were appointed from the *tribuni notarii*,[4] and whose duties it was to present petitions to the Emperor, to transmit imperial answers to the requests of officials and to convey unwritten orders of the Emperor to judges both in the capital and in the provinces,[5] came under the supervision of the Master to the same extent as the *notarii* themselves.[6]

A similar relation with the Master of the Offices may be claimed for the *schola* of the *stratores*, whose services were employed in connection with the selection of horses for the imperial stables.[7] The services of the *stratores* were also under the Master's judicial authority, as we learn from a letter of Symmachus,[8] dating from 384–85, dealing with a case where a Master had claimed for his jurisdiction a *strator*, whose appeal from the court of the governor of Apulia was brought before the Urban Prefect. This is the earliest reference to the exercise of judicial functions by the Master of the Offices.

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 16, 4: *Ne ad diversa tracti viri devoti silenitarii iudicia sacris abstrahi videantur obsequiis, iubemus eos qui quemlibet devotissimorum silentiariorum scholae vel eius uxorem civiliter vel etiam criminaliter pulsare maluerint, minime eum ex cuiuslibet alterius iudicio nisi ex iudicio tantummodo viri excellentissimi magistri officiorum conveniri.*

[2] Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, p. 845.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 7, 2. [4] *De Caer.*, 1, 86.

[5] Bury, *Magistri scriniorum*, ἀντιγραφῆς and ῥεφερενδάριοι, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXI, pp. 27–9. [6] *Novellae Justiniani*, 10 (535).

[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 31, 1 (365–73?) = *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 24, 1; *Cod. Theod.*, VIII, 8, 4 = *Cod. Just.* XII, 59, 3; Ammianus, 30, 5; Gothofredus, *Cod. Theod.*, vol. 2, p. 224.

[8] *Relationes*, [10], 38, 4: *Venatium, quem v. c. et inlustris officiorum magister iusserat exhiberi, censui agenti in rebus, Decentio, quo prosequente venerat, esse reddendum.*

Digitized by Google

We now come to those *officia* which, not only in matters pertaining to organization, discipline, and jurisdiction, but also in the active execution of their duties, came to a greater or less extent under the Master's direction. These *officia* comprised the *agentes in rebus*, the *admissionales*, the *cancellarii*, the *decani*, the *lampadarii*, the *mensores*, and the *scrinium memoriae*, *scrinium epistularum*, *scrinium libellorum*, and *scrinium dispositionum*.

The *admissionales*, or *officium admissionum*, are placed at the Master's disposal in the *Notitia Dignitatum*.[1] They were a corps of court ushers, which had developed under the Principate and had been carried over into the Empire, where its importance was enhanced owing to the increased attention paid to the details of court ceremonial.[2] Its immediate chief was at first the *magister admissionum*,[3] who by the sixth century had acquired the title of *comes admissionum*.[4] This *officium* assisted the Master of the Offices in the direction of the receptions and audiences, and must have been subject to his jurisdiction as well as to his orders in general.

The *cancellarii* in the immediate service of the Emperor are mentioned only in the *Notitia* for the Occident, as being under the Master's orders.[5] However, as has been noted,[6] it is altogether likely that there was a similar body under the Eastern Master.

The *decani* do not appear in either *Notitia* but their *schola* was under the Master's supervision as early as 416,[7] and in 434[8] (?) they were made subject to the sole jurisdiction of his court.

The *lampadarii* are named in the oriental *Notitia*[9] only, but a constitution of Valentinian III,[10] 450 A.D., shows that in the West their *schola* was wholly under the Master's control and that regulations affecting its organization were issued in accordance with his recommendations.

All these *officia* performed duties of so humble a character that it would be impossible to expect a greater amount of information regarding them in their relation to the Master of the Offices. However, from the few notices that occur it is quite

[1] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 17: *occ.* IX, 14.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 35, 3 (319); cf. *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 1, 3; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 1, p. 382; *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXVI, pp. 110 ff.

[3] Ammianus, 15, 5, 18; *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 2, 23.

[4] *De Caer.*, 1, 184: κόμης ἀδμησιόνων.

[5] *Notitia Dignitatum occ.* IX, 15. [6] P. 38.

[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 33, 1; cf. *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 26, 1.

[8] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 26, 2. [9] *Notitia Dignitatum, or.* XI, 12.

[10] *Novellae Valentiniani*, 30.

Digitized by Google

evident that both administratively and judicially they were entirely under his control.

The *scrinium dispositionum* differed widely from the other three *scrinia* both in the character of its activities and with regard to the officials who directed them. Consequently it can be given separate consideration. This bureau was organized about the middle of the fourth century,[1] and from its establishment was probably under the control of the Master of the Offices, as were the older *scrinia* at that time. In the *Notitia*[2] it appears *sub dispositione eius*, and, like the other *scrinia*, was subject to his disciplinary and judicial authority.[3] The immediate chief of this *scrinium* was originally called the *magister dispositionum*,[4] later the *comes dispositionum*,[5] but in rank he was only the equal of the *proximi* of the other *scrinia*.[6] There is no trace of this official having an independent sphere of action, or of his being under the authority of any other than the Master of the Offices.

The duty of the *scrinium dispositionum* was to prepare the program of imperial business and engagements, especially that part of it which concerned the number and routes of the imperial journeys, and possibly the lists of those to be summoned to court receptions of various kinds.[7] In the Byzantine period, the official known as the ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως, who from the ninth century played the part of a Master of Ceremonies at the court, seems to have been the older *comes dispositionum* with a new title, emancipated from the Master's control.[8] He was at that time the superior of the ἀδμηνσουνάλιος,[9] who was probably the same as the κόμης ἀδμηνσιόνων,[10] formerly also, as head of the *officium admissionum*, under the Master's orders.

There remain for consideration the *agentes in rebus*, the *mensores*, and the *scrinia sacrae memoriae*, *epistularum*, and *libellorum*. The question of their connection with the Master of

[1] The first mention is in *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 21, 6 (362).

[2] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI. 16; *occ.* IX, 11.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 11 (Anastasius), cf. XII, 19, 7 (443–44), and other constitutions concerning all the *scrinia*.

[4] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 26, 2 (381).

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 2, 23 (414).

[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 26, 2 (381).

[7] Gothofredus on *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 26, 1; Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, vol. 2, p. 103; Karlowa, *Romische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, p. 836; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 647.

[8] Bury, *Imperial Administration*, pp. 118–9.

[9] *De Caer.*, 800, 8; 805, 4.

[10] *De Caer.*, 386, 25. It is perhaps this *comes* who appears in Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 17, under the name of ἀδμισσιονάλιος.

Digitized by Google

the Offices involves a somewhat lengthy discussion; separate sections have therefore been assigned to them in this chapter. In general, the Master's authority over these *officia* was very similar to that which he exercised over those just mentioned, including disciplinary and judicial powers as well as the direction of a considerable part of their active duties.

We are now in a position to appreciate the meaning of Cassiodorus, when in his Formula of the Master's office[1] he wrote with reference to the latter's control of the *officia palatina*: *Tam multi ordines sine confusione aliqua componuntur, et ipse sustinet onus omnium quod habet turba discretum*; adding, in allusion to his judicial authority over them, as well as over others, *causarum praeterea maximum pondus in eius audientiae finibus optima securitate reponimus.*

With the gradual diminution of his power in the course of the seventh and eighth centuries[2] the Master saw the control of the *officia palatina* transferred to other hands, until in the ninth century he exercised no authority whatever over them.

III. The Master of the Offices and the *Agentes in Rebus*

The *schola* of the *agentes in rebus* was probably established by Diocletian[3] to take the place of the so-called *frumentarii* of the Principate, whom he had abolished,[4] although the earliest notice of the Agentes occurs in a constitution of Constantine I, dating from 319.[5] The *frumentarii* were originally soldiers sent into the provinces to supervise the transportation of grain for the provisioning of the army (*frumentum militare*), but had developed into secret agents of the imperial administration, having also under their care the *cursus publicus* or State Post.[6] These latter were the duties that fell to the lot of the Agentes.

The *schola* of the Agentes was a large one. At first, apparently, their number was not definitely limited, but could be augmented at the pleasure of those in control as administrative needs

[1] *Variae*, 6, 6.

[2] See pp. 50–53.

[3] Hirschfeld, *Die Agentes in Rebus*, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1893, p. 422.

[4] Aurelius Victor, *Caesares*, 39, 44: *remoto pestilenti frumentariorum genere, quorum nunc agentes rerum simillimi sunt*; Hieronymus, *in Abdiam*, 1, *Eos enim quos nunc agentes in rebus vel veredarios appellant, veteres frumentarios nominabant*; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 26.

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 35, 3 fin.

[6] Fiebiger, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 7, pp. 122 f.

Digitized by Google

might require. However, the Emperor Julian, in the interests of the provincials,[1] reduced their number to seventeen. This restriction probably was effective only until the end of his reign, for in 430 the authorized number, *statuti*, of Agentes on the roll of the *schola* was eleven hundred and seventy-four.[2] In the time of Leo[3] it had been increased to twelve hundred and forty-eight, and besides these there was a long waiting list of *supernumerarii* ready to fill any vacancies that might occur in the ranks of the regulars. The Agentes were looked upon as soldiers; they were dressed and organized as a military corps, and were divided into five grades, with regular promotion from the lowest to the highest.[4]

The supervision and direction of the Agentes at the outset was certainly in the hands of the Pretorian Prefect, but under Constantine it was transferred to the Master of the Offices,[5] whose connection with this *schola* was maintained so long as he continued to be an active administrative official. According to the *Notitia Dignitatum* the Master had under his control both the *schola* at the court and its deputies on special service elsewhere.[6]

At first, apparently, the Master controlled admissions to the *schola;*[7] but in 399[8] the sanction of the Emperor, which probably had been ordinarily obtained before, became an essential requisite for those who desired to be enrolled among the Agentes, and, once granted, this permit could not be cancelled. However, the right of nominating to the *schola* had been granted to certain officials and to Agentes who had obtained the rank of *princeps*.[9] This privilege was not expressly revoked, but the nominations thus made had now to receive the imperial approval. Neglect of the regulation put into force in 399 probably caused Leo to reaffirm the necessity of securing an imperial *probatoria* for admission to service with the Agentes.[10]

[1] Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. 2, p. 103.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 23. [3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 20, 3.

[4] Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 422 f.; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 1, pp. 776 f.

[5] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 26; cf. pp. 29–34. The earliest proof of the Master's control dates from 359; *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 9, 1.

[6] *Schola agentum in rebus et deputati eiusdem scholae*, *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, *occ.* IX.

[7] *Cod. Theod.*, I, 9, 1 (359); VI, 27, 3 (380); Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 1, p. 776.

[8] *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 27, 11: *Consultissima definitione statuimus, ut executionem agentis in rebus inconsultis nobis nemo mereatur, concessam vero quispiam revocare non audeat.*

[9] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 8 (396), not repeated in *Codex Justinianus*.

[10] *Cod. Just.*, XII, 20, 3 fin.: *Nemo autem sine divali probatoria, quam codices in sacro nostro scrinio memoriae positi debeant inserendam accipere, militaribus eiusdem devotissimae scholae stipendiis vel privilegiis potiatur.*

Digitized by Google

The task of removing from the roll of the Agentes the names of such persons as had illegally succeeded in having themselves entered thereon, was upon several occasions undertaken by the Master at the Emperor's orders.[1] Such purgings involved the right of dismissal by the Master, and apparently he possessed such power until 415, when this privilege was withdrawn,[2] and the right of sanctioning dismissals as well as admissions was reserved for the Emperor alone, and the Master required a special warrant before removing any one from the *schola*.[3]

The *matricula*, or accredited roll of the Agentes, was placed by an imperial warrant under the care of the Master, whose duty it likewise was to inquire into the degree of efficiency and assiduity possessed by the various members of the *schola*, so that in conferring promotions and honors the preference might be given to those who had exhibited the greatest industry and capacity.[4] Promotion within the *schola* was thus under his supervision; although advancement was regularly made on the basis of seniority,[5] there was an opportunity for preferment upon the Master's recommendation. In exceptional cases promotion out of the regular order might be made by special sanction of the Emperor,[6] which was usually granted on the recommendation of a majority of the *schola*.[7] Such a recommendation was originally required in the appointment of the *adiutor* of the Master, who was regarded as the head of the *schola*, but later the Master was left freedom of choice subject to the imperial confirmation.[8]

[1] *Cod. Theod.*, I, 9, 1 (359): *Universi, qui indignis natalibus et conversatione deterrima ad scholam agentum in rebus adspiraverunt vel translati sunt, cognoscente v. c. comite et magistro officiorum vestro consortio secernantur.* Cf. also VI, 27, 17 (415); 18 (416); 23, 1 (430).

[2] *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 27, 17: *Merito magnificentia tua concessam sibi pridem a nostra maiestate licentiam pro removendis his, quorum consortio agentum in rebus schola laborabat, ad nostram denuo auctoritatem credidit revocandam. Nulli igitur posthac sine nostrae maiestatis auctoritate discingendi agentem in rebus, nulli eximendi pateat copia*; cf. *Cod. Just.*, XII, 20, 2. Seeck thinks that this constitution applied to the East only, and that the Master had lost the right of dismissal in the West in 399 (Pauly-Wissowa, 1, 777 on *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 27, 11). However, in that year it was only ordered that the Master could not reject a candidate for admission who had secured an imperial *probatoria*.

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 18.

[4] *Cod. Theod.*, I, 9, 3 (405): *Magnificentia tua matriculam scholae agentum in rebus ex nostra auctoritate tractabit atque perficiet*; VI, 27, 23; *Cod. Just.*, XII, 20, 3 (Leo).

[5] *Cod. Theod.*, I, 9, 1 = *Cod. Just.*, I, 31, 1; *Cod. Theod.*, I, 9, 2 = *Cod. Just.*, I, 31, 2; *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 27, 20; 21; 14 = *Cod. Just.*, XII, 20, 1.

[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 3; 7; 9; 19.

[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 4; 28, 8; 29, 4.

[8] Compare *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 9, 1 and *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 1.

Digitized by Google

There was evidently a considerable tendency to attempt to gain undeserved promotion by the use of influence or other illegitimate means, for numerous constitutions were published to check this evil.[1]

The Master, being in control of the *deputati* of the *schola*, had to see that the Agentes despatched on public business to the provinces, or granted leave of absence for a fixed period, did not overstay their time limit.[2]

The general supervision of the *schola*, with the duty of enforcing the imperial regulations regarding it and of making suggestions for a more efficient administration, rested with the Master.[3] His *adiutor* and *subadiuvae* might also be held responsible in case of transgression of the rules of the *schola*.[4] These rules were not always very strictly observed if we may judge from the necessity which the Emperors felt of issuing edicts at frequent intervals to enforce obedience to them. The honors and privileges of the Agentes were likewise safeguarded by the Master of the Offices.[5]

He also exercised judicial authority over them, and, from the time of Leo,[6] all Agentes of the rank of *ducenarius* or *centenarius*, while in the city of Constantinople, had the privilege of answering all civil and criminal charges in the court of the Master or his representative. This right was also extended to the *subadiuvae*, who, however, lost it on the expiry of their term of office unless they had attained the rank of *centenarii*. But all *centenarii* while in the provinces were subject to the regular judicial authorities, unless they were entrusted with the performance of public business.

Turning from the organization of the *schola* to consider its activities, we find that a great part of these consisted in the execution of the Emperor's commands, the delivery of imperial documents, and the providing of escorts at the imperial pleasure. In short, the Agentes might be called upon to undertake any service that the Emperor desired to be performed. From their duties as

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 9, 1 and 2; VI, 29, 4; VI, 27, 14 = *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 20, 1, etc.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 15 (412).

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 23 (430): *Cuncta, quae super agentum in rebus militia ordine loco numero statuisti, amplectimur; Cod. Just.*, XII, 20, 3 (Leo).

[4] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 3.

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 20 (426); *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 20, 5 (Leo); 9 (Anastasius).

[6] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 20, 4.

Digitized by Google

despatch-riders they were sometimes called in Greek ἀγγελιαφόροι. They had further to bring in reports on whatever occurrences or conditions in the provinces appeared to them to be worth while making known to the central government, thus playing the part of an imperial secret service.[1]

It was also the Agentes who supplied the annual inspectors of the public post, who, as *deputati* of this *schola*, came under the immediate supervision of the Master of the Offices.[2] The relation of these inspectors to the Master will be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent section. The Agentes likewise provided the Master with his special staff or *officium*, which will also be given separate consideration.

From the highest grade of the Agentes, the *ducenarii*, were selected the *principes* or heads of the *officia* both of the Prefects and the most important civil governors in both the Orient and the Occident, as well as of the military governors in the Orient.[3] In the Gothic kingdom of Theoderic in Italy the *comites* and *duces* also received their *principes officii* from the *officium* of the Master of the Offices,[4] in obvious imitation of the practice in the Orient. In the case of officials of the rank of *illustris*, the *principes* ceased to be members of the *schola* of the Agentes and came completely under the authority of the officers over whose bureaus they were placed. With the *spectabiles*, however, the *principes* continued to be regarded merely as *deputati* of the *schola* and remained to a certain extent under the supervision of the Master of the Offices.[5] Through these *principes* the court could keep a strict watch over the actions of the provincial governors and had an official spy permanently in attendance upon each.[6]

Finally, the Agentes were at the Master's disposal for employment on any special mission which he desired to have undertaken. An instance of this character was the despatch, in 384 A.D., of an Agens by the Master of the Offices to the Urban Prefect to

[1] Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 1, pp. 778–9; *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. 2, pp. 102–4.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 2; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10.

[3] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XXI–XXIX, XXXI–XXXVI; *occ.* XVIII–XXIII; *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 28 = *Cod. Just.*, XII, 21. *de principibus agentum in rebus; Novellae Valentiniani*, 28; Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, p. 882.

[4] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 7, 24; 25; Mommsen, *Neues Archiv*, vol. 14, p. 504.

[5] *Novellae Valentiniani*, 28 (449); *Cod. Just.*, XII, 21, 4; 6; 8 (484): *viros clarissimos eiusdem scholae principes*; Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 475 ff.

[6] Seeck, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 96.

Digitized by Google

demand the person of a *strator* who had been brought before an ordinary court but who was claimed for the Master's jurisdiction.[1]

Thus it was through his position as chief of the Agentes that the Master became in a certain sense the head of the imperial intelligence office and, owing to his consequent possession of the secrets of state, one of the most influential personages at the court.

The peculiarly close relation between the Master and the Agentes is evidenced by the name *magisteriani*, which was given to the members of this *schola*,[2] and which appears frequently in Greek as μαγιστριανοί.[3] It would seem as though the whole *schola* was regarded as forming a larger *officium* of the Master of the Offices.[4]

It is questionable whether the Agentes were in existence in the Ostrogothic Kingdom in Italy. Mommsen[5] identified with them the *comitiaci* or *comitiani*, who appear there as a special corps for the execution of royal orders of various kinds. However, Seeck[6] has advanced good reasons for believing that these *comitiaci* had their origin in the *officiales* of the *comites et magistri militum* rather than in the Agentes of the Master of the Offices. He points out that the title *comes* in the fifth century was employed with ever increasing rarity by the *magister officiorum*, whereas it continued to be a favorite designation of the *magistri militum*, and the important position which these Masters of the Soldiery occupied at that time in the Empire of the West would warrant their *officiales* assuming a position very similar to that held by the Agentes in the East. If this latter view is accepted, we must admit that the Agentes had been displaced altogether by these *comitiaci*, as indeed seems probable, for the *comitiaci* were in direct dependence upon the royal authority and not under the Master's orders.[7] Further, the creation of the distinctly Gothic corps of the *saiones*, whose duties also corresponded to those of the Agentes, might have removed the necessity for the continuance of that *schola*.

[1] Symmachus, *Relationes*, [10], 38.

[2] Du Cange, *Glossarium*, s. v.; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 1, p. 776.

[3] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 3, 7; 12, etc.; Du Cange, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

[4] Evidence lies in the regulations affecting the Agentes in the title *de officio magistri officiorum*, *Cod. Theod.*, I, 9, 1; 2; 3; *Cod. Just.*, I, 31, 1; 2.

[5] *Neues Archiv*, vol. 14, pp. 469–72.

[6] Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, pp. 715–6.

[7] Seeck, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

Digitized by Google

In the Empire of the East the Agentes continued in the same relations with the Master of the Offices until the eighth century,[1] but with his loss of control over the post and other branches of the administration in that and the following century, his need of an *officium* ceased, and his connection with the Agentes had no further warrant. And the *schola* of the Agentes, at least under its old name and organization, does not appear either in the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos of the ninth century, or in the list of Byzantine Court Offices compiled by Codinus Curopalates in the twelfth.

IV. The Master of the Offices and the *Cursus Publicus*

Up to the time of Constantine the Great, the ***cursus publicus***, or state post, an establishment created under the Principate for the rapid conveyance of imperial despatches and persons travelling on state business throughout the Empire, had been under the supervision of officers called ***praefecti vehiculorum***,[2] roughly 'Superintendents of stage service,' subject to the control of the Pretorian Prefects. These ***praefecti vehiculorum*** were chosen from among the ***memoriales*** and other ***palatini***.[3] But as early as the reign of Constantius[4] they had been supplanted by ***praepositi cursus publici***, who from the first were popularly known as ***curagendarii*** or ***curiosi***,[5] so called, Lydus[6] explains, because it was their duty to inspect the ***evectiones***, or passes, which entitled their holders to make use of the post service. This popular designation, ***curiosi***, had, by 381 at least, been adopted as an official title.[7]

Now the ***praefecti vehiculorum*** had been subordinates of the Pretorian Prefects, but the ***curiosi*** were sent out from the corps of the ***agentes in rebus***,[8] and the members of any other ***officia*** were

[1] Cf. the use of μαγιστριανός as late as 705 A.D., by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De adm. imp.*, c. 32. Cf. Hirschfeld, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1893, p. 440.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 4, 1 (326); Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 1859.

[3] Gothofredus, *Paratit.* to *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 29.

[4] *C. I. L.*, X, 7200: DUCENARIUS AGENS IN REB(us) ET P(rae)P(ositus) CURSUS PUBLICI (340–50); cf. Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, 1893, p. 432; *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 29, 9.

[5] *Ii, quos curagenda(ri)os sive curiosos provincialium consuetudo appellat*, *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 29, 1 (355).

[6] *De Mag.*, 2, 10; cf. *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 29, 2 (357); 29, 8 = *Just.*, XII, 22, 2.

[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 6; cf. VI, 29, 10 (412); 11 (414).

[8] *C. I. L.*, X, 7200, quoted above; *Cod. Theod.*, VI, 29, 2 (357): *Agentes in rebus in curis agendis et evectionibus publici cursus inspiciendis*; 29, 6; 29, 8: *Agentes in rebus singulos per singulas provincias mi(tten)dos esse censemus.*

Digitized by Google

strictly forbidden to attempt to act in this capacity.[1] And since, as we have seen, the Agentes were under the direction of the Master of the Offices, it followed that the supervision of the use of the passes was now transferred from the Prefects' to the Master's sphere of duties.[2]

The selection of the *curiosi* to be sent into the provinces was directed by the Master of the Offices.[3] They were chosen according to seniority within the ranks of their *schola* and with the approval of their fellows,[4] were appointed on the anniversary of the Emperor's birthday, and remained in this service for one year only.[5] During this time they acted under the Master's order.[6] In 357, two of these inspectors were despatched to each province,[7] but later one was considered sufficient.[8] However, this restriction, which had been imposed in 395, was cancelled in 412,[9] and an older custom was once more adopted, whereby an indefinite number of *curiosi* could be sent into the various districts where their presence was required. But finally a return was made to the provision of the edict of 395 limiting the number to one inspector for every province,[10] although it is uncertain at what date it was again enforced.

This limitation upon the number of the inspectors was probably intended to safeguard the interests of the provincials, whose oppression by *curiosi* from the *schola* of the Agentes caused the exclusion of the latter from Africa[11] and Dalmatia.[12] However, it may well be that the *curiosi* thus excluded from the provinces mentioned were not *curiosi cursus publici* but *curiosi litorum*,[13] members of the corps of the Agentes sent on special service to various ports and harbors, for the name *curiosi* was used for Agentes in other business than the supervision of the post.[14] In

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI. 29, 2 = *Justinianus*, XII, 22, 2: *ideoque solos agentes in rebus in hoc genere iussimus obsequium adhibere et non ab alio penitus officio.*

[2] Cf. Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 26; 3, 40; also pp. 34–35 above.

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 6; 8. [4] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 4 (359).

[5] *Op. cit.*, VI, 29, 6 (381).

[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI. 29, 10 (412): *curiosis ex viri inl(ustris) comitis et magistri officiorum iudicio dirigendis.* [7] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 2, 1 (357).

[8] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 8 (395): *Agentes in rebus singulos per singulas provincias mi(tten)dos esse censemus.* [9] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 10.

[10] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 22, 4.

[11] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 11 (414), extended by *Novellae Valentiniani*, 13, 7 (445) to Numidia and Mauretania Sitifensis. [12] *Codex Theodosianus*, XII, (415).

[13] So in *Novellae Valentiniani*, 13, 7.

[14] Hirschfeld, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1893, p. 440. Hudemann, *Geschichte des römischen Postwesens*, p. 95, holds that they were *curiosi cursus publici*.

Digitized by Google

support of this view it may be urged that the exactions which caused the exclusion of the *curiosi* in question are hardly in accord with the powers of those engaged in the service of the state post, which since 395 [1] had been strictly limited to the inspection of passes.

The burden of supporting the establishment of the *cursus publicus* fell upon the provincials of the districts which it traversed; in consequence, the oversight of its maintenance rested with the provincial governors and their superior, the Pretorian Prefect, and not with the Master of the Offices.[2] In the Eastern Empire this arrangement was still in force under Justinian,[3] but in the Ostrogothic Kingdom of Theoderic the Master of the Offices had been made responsible for the condition of the postal establishments,[4] and the money paid in fines for the abuse of privileges in using the state conveyances was expended on their maintenance through the *officium* of the Master.[5] This new system was rendered feasible by the comparatively small extent of territory controlled by the Gothic Kings.

There was also another change introduced in the Gothic Kingdom in connection with the control of the state post. As was previously noted, it is highly probable that the Agentes no longer existed in Italy at this date, and that the duty of inspecting the passes had been transferred to royal *saiones*,[6] with due reservation of the customary rights of certain *praefecti*, who may have been deputed from the Master's office, although their position is not clearly defined.

The right to make use of the state post, as has been said, was granted by the issuing of *evectiones* or passes. In order to prevent too heavy a burden being laid upon the provinces responsible for the upkeep of the *cursus publicus*, by allowing an unduly great number to make use of this convenience, a limi-

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 8; cf. *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 22, 4.

[2] Cf. *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, and *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 50.

[3] Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 3, 40; *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 50.

[4] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6, 3: *Veredorum quin etiam opportunam velocitatem, quorum status semper in cursu est, diligentiae suae districtione custodit, ut sollicitudines nostras, quas consilio iuvat, beneficio celeritatis expediat.*

[5] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 5, 5, 4 (523–26): *quam summam protinus exactam, sicut iam anterioribus edictis constitutum est, per officium magisteriae dignitatis cursui proficere debere censemus.* The formula for the Pretorian Prefect has nothing relative to the upkeep of the *cursus publicus* (Cass., *op. cit.*, 6, 3, 511).

[6] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 5, 5 (523–526).

Digitized by Google

tation of the right to issue passes was necessary. This right was a privilege highly prized, and the imperial government found great difficulty in restricting it to reasonable limits, while yet allowing those really justified in using the postal service to have the power to do so. Not until the fifth century was the privilege of granting passes definitely regulated.

The right to issue such passes was, of course, ultimately an imperial prerogative. However, under Constantine I, it seems to have been exercised independently by the Pretorian Prefect [1] and other officials. Among the latter were the provincial governors, who lost the privilege in 354.[2] By 357 the Master of the Offices was also in possession of this right,[3] but, owing to the abuse of the privilege, Julian, in 362, deprived all officials, except the Pretorian Prefect, of the right to issue *evectiones*, although giving to certain others the right to dispose of a definite number signed by himself.[4]

Under the successors of Julian, however, there was once more an extension of this privilege. In 364 the Urban Prefect was given authority to issue passes in matters of state business,[5] a right which he had lost again by 382 A.D.;[6] and in 371 the Senate obtained a like privilege for delegations proceeding to and from the Emperor.[7] By 365 the Master of the Offices was acting as the imperial representative in granting *evectiones*,[8] and in 378, along with the Prefect, he had the power in certain cases of adding to the privileges in making use of the state post which were specified in the individual passes.[9] Still in 382 the Emperor and the Prefect alone possessed the right to issue

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 3 (326).

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 5; cf. VIII, 5, 40 (382).

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 9: *sufficere namque posse confidimus, quae isdem a nobis vel magistri officiorum comitatus nostri jussis necessaria habita ratione praebentur.*

[4] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 12 (362).

[5] *Codex Theodosianus*, VII, 5, 19.

[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 40; more explicitly in *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 50, 9.

[7] *Cod. Theod.* VIII, 5, 32; cf. *Just.* XII, 50, 6.

[8] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 22: *Praeterea illud adiungimus, ut parhippum vel avertarium nullus accipiat, nullus inpune praesumat, nisi eum nostrae serenitatis arbitrio aliqua necessitate cogente vir inl(ustris) magister officiorum textui evectionis addiderit*; cf. Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 1859.

[9] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 35, 1: *Si tamen necessitas maior coegerit, super sollemnem numerum iubemus admitti quos aut sacras litteras ferre constiterit aut habere in evectionibus adnotatum, ut aliqua de causa instantius ire iubeantur, quod vel spectabilis viri officiorum magistri vel sinceritatis tuae litteris oportet adscribi.*

Digitized by Google

such passes,[1] although it was not very long after this that the Master of the Offices acquired the same authority as the Prefect, which he enjoyed at the opening of the fifth century[2] and retained for the future.

By this time, following the system inaugurated by Julian, a definite number of passes had been granted to certain other high officials to dispose of during their term of office.[3] This was the ultimate settlement of the question, and under Justinian the right to give extra passes was limited to the sovereign, to the Prefect, and to the Master of the Offices.[4] The same condition prevailed in Italy under Theoderic, where the Master acted as the representative of the sovereign in this matter.[5]

The relations of the Pretorian Prefect and the Master of the Offices in respect to the *evectiones* require further definition. It seems that from 395 in the Eastern Empire the Prefect, although possessed of the right to issue these passes, had to submit them for approval to a representative of the Master of the Offices. Says Lydus,[6] speaking of the time of Rufinus:

"Since it was impracticable that the Prefect should have the burden of maintaining the state horses and those in charge of them throughout the provinces, while the control over and the administration of these was in the hands of others, a law was promulgated to the effect that the Prefect should indeed retain the care of the *cursus publicus*, but that the senior of the *frumentarii* (*i.e.* Agentes), who is at present called *princeps*, should continually be present in the office of the Pretorian Prefect, and should actively scrutinize and inquire into the reasons why many used the state post on the authority of passes provided by the prefecture (for which reason he was called *curiosus*, equivalent to περίεργος, and not he alone, but all those who superintended the state horses in the provinces), while the so-called Master appended his signature to these *evecti-*

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 40.

[2] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, *magister officiorum ipse emittit*; omitted in *occ.* IX.

[3] *Notitia Dignitatum*, passim; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 1860.

[4] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 50, 9: *Iudicibus faciendae evectionis copiam denegamus, cum id tantum nostro numini et tuae sedi nec non viro illustri magistro officiorum sit reservandum, cum neque praefecto urbis neque magistris militum neque ducibus neque vicariis nec cuiquam alii praeter memoratas duas potestates hoc a nobis concessum sit.*

[5] According to Cassiodorus (*Variae*, 6, 3, 3), the Pretorian Prefect *evectiones simili potestate* (i.e. *pro sua deliberatione*) *distribuit*; id. ibid., 6, 6, *per eum* (the Master of the Offices) *nominis nostri destinatur evectio, et isti principaliter creditur quam tam necessarium esse creditur*; cf. also 5, 5, 2.

[6] *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 3, 40; cf. 3, 23.

Digitized by Google

ones. And that this is so, one may learn from the constitution itself, which although incorporated in the old Codex of Theodosius, has been omitted in the new code."

This account agrees with what the same author has to say regarding the *regendarii* in the Prefect's *officium* in the sixth century:[1]

"The *regendarius* is still said to be placed in charge of the *evectiones* for the state post, but his functions are purely nominal, for the Master of the Offices has taken over the full control of the business."

This testimony must be credited for the time at which Lydus wrote, and there seems to be no adequate reason for disbelieving his statements with regard to the arrangements in force after 395, even if the constitution to which he refers is not found in our text of the Theodosian Code.[2] We may attribute to this period a reorganization of the post service with stricter centralization of control,[3] as a result of which the *evectiones* that the Prefect issued had to be passed by a *princeps* from the Agentes and countersigned by the Master of the Offices. This *princeps* was the *princeps* of the Prefect's *officium*, who was advanced to that post from the *schola* of the Agentes.[4] Although Lydus calls him variously πρῶτος τῶν φρουμενταρίων,[5] κουρίωσος,[6] πρίγκιψ τῆς τάξεως τοῦ μαγίστρου,[7] and πρίγκιψ τῶν μαγιστριανῶν,[8] this identification is clear from the use of the title *princeps*, which was not applied to any member of the Master's *officium*, and the account of his relation to the *cornicularius* of the Prefect's office.[9] It was probably about the close of the fourth century also that the number of the passes annually allotted to the various administrative posts was defined as in the *Notitia.*

[1] *De Mag.*, 3, 4: ῥεγενδάριοι δύο οἱ τὸν δημόσιον δρόμον ἰθύνοντες; 21: ὁ ῥεγενδάριος ἐπὶ τῆς φροντίδος τῶν συνθημάτων τοῦ δημοσίου δρόμου τεταγμένος ἔτι καὶ νῦν λέγεται μέν, πράττει δὲ οὐδέν, τοῦ μαγίστρου τῆς αὐλῆς τὴν ὅλην ὑφελομένου τοῦ πράγματος ἐξουσίαν; cf. *Notitia Dignitatum or.* II, *regerendarius*, III *id.*

[2] So Hirschfeld, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1893, p. 439, n. 7, against Mommsen, *Ostgothische Studien, Neues Archiv*, vol. 14, p. 475, n. 1. *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 35 (378), which Mommsen, in his edition of the Code, suggests is the constitution mentioned by Lydus, does not agree in date or substance with the latter, and, further, appears in part in *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 50, 8.

[3] Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, *l.c.*, would attribute this reform to Rufinus. But it is more likely that this restriction upon the Prefect's power would come after his fall, as Lydus says, *De Mag.*, 3, 23.

[4] Cf. p. 72, above.

[5] *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 3, 40.

[6] *De Mag.*, loc. cit.

[7] *De Mag.*, 3, 23.

[8] *De Mag.*, 3, 24.

[9] *De Mag.*, 3, 23–4.

Digitized by Google

Evidence is not lacking of conflicts arising between the Pretorian Prefects and the Master of the Offices with regard to their respective spheres of competence in connection with the *cursus publicus*. As early as 357 a special constitution prohibited the Prefect from granting passes to the Agentes, who were henceforth to receive them only from the Emperor or the Master.[1] And two years later protection was given the Agentes, when serving as *curiosi*, from the judicial power of the Prefect, provided that they acted as befitted their office.[2] This division of control is further emphasized by the requirement that persons using the post service without a pass, or exceeding the privileges granted therein, should be detained and reported both to the Prefect and to the Master.[3] Under Justinian this provision was so far modified that only offenders of rank were thus reported to the Master, while the Prefect was empowered to deal alone with those of inferior status.[4] In the *officium* of the Master, in addition to the *curiosus cursus publici praesentalis* already mentioned, there were included, in the inspectors of the state post throughout the provinces, the *curiosi omnium provinciarum*.[5] Through these again, as well as through the other Agentes, the Master of the Offices was the centre of an espionage system stretching out from the capital to the furthest corners of the Empire.

The Master continued to control the use of the state post until the creation of the Logothete of the Post (λογοθέτης τοῦ δρόμου), whose office arose from that of the *curiosus cursus publici praesentalis*, and who became the head of an independent department of the administration in charge of this portion of the Master's duties during the eighth century.[6]

V. The Master of the Offices and the *Mensores*

From the time of Constantine I, the quartering of officers and soldiers, on their way to and from the scene of active service, upon

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5. 9.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 29, 3; cf. *Justinianus*, XII, 22, 3.

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 5, 8 (357).

[4] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 50, 3: *Si quidem dignitate praeditus sit, de eius nomine ac prudentiam tuam et ad illustrem virum comitem et magistrum officiorum referri.*

[5] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, *occ.* IX.

[6] Bury, *Imperial Administration*, p. 91. The state post was not abolished by Justinian, but merely restricted in the Orient; cf. Hirschfeld, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1893, p. 440, n. 1, against Hudemann, *Geschichte der romischen Postwesens*, 95, on Procopius, *Anecdota*, 30; Lydus, *De Mag.* 3, 61.

Digitized by Google

the inhabitants of the towns and districts through which they passed, became a regularly established system. The same method was used in obtaining quarters for the Emperor and his suite, whenever he undertook a journey from his capital. This obligatory reception of public servants by householders was called *hospitium*, or *hospitalitas*, and the quarters furnished were known as *metata*. The officials whose duty it was to prepare such quarters for the Emperor and to indicate lodgings for the individual *palatini* accompanying him, as well as for other persons, were the *mensores* or *metatores*,[1] 'Quartermasters.'

The *mensores* formed a *schola* at the palace, headed by a *primicerius* who, after two years' service, was placed on the list of the Agentes at the foot of the register.[2] It is most likely that the Master of the Offices was placed in charge of these Quartermasters by Constantine I, at the time when his office received its great increase of power. However, the earliest direct evidence of any connection between them and the Master is found in a constitution of 368 or 373,[3] instructing the Master to see that synagogues were not occupied by those who had the right of *hospitium*. From a constitution of 405,[4] we see that the organization of the schola of the *mensores* was under the Master's supervision, and the *Notitia* of the Orient[5] places it among the *officia* which were subject to his commands. Although the occidental *Notitia* fails to mention them, their status in the West was undoubtedly the same as in the East.

As with other officials under his orders, the Master probably exercised exclusive jurisdiction over the Quartermasters. His authority over them remained undiminished in the Eastern Empire under Justinian,[6] but there is no trace of them in Italy under the Gothic régime.

In supervising the work of the *mensores*, the chief care of the Master of the Offices was to see that they did not demand more than was authorized by law in making their assignments of *hospitia*, and that they had regard for the exemptions that were granted to certain officials, to the *illustres*, and to those engaged in specific

[1] Gothofredus *ad Cod. Theod.* VI, 34, 1; *Paratit. ad Cod. Theod.* VII; Cagnat, in Daremberg et Saglio, vol. 3, pp. 302–303, s. v. *hospitium*.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 34, 1 (405).

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VII, 8, 2; cf. *Codex Justinianus*, I, 9, 4.

[4] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 34, 1; cf. *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 59, 10.

[5] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 12. [6] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 9, 4; XII, 40, 1, etc.

Digitized by Google

occupations.[1] In this connection we may note that it was upon the recommendation of the Master Aemilianus that in 400 A.D. the *fabricenses* were relieved of the burden of *hospitium*.[2]

In addition to his direction of the *mensores*, it was the Master's duty to exercise a general oversight of the whole system of *metata*, preventing, on the one hand, any unwarranted exactions on the part of those entitled to the privileges of *hospitium*, and, on the other, forcing those who were subject to this service to fulfil their obligations.[3] The authority which the Master of the Offices exercised over the *mensores* formed a part of his general powers as head of the *officia palatina*, while the placing in his hands of the supervision of the whole system of quartering gave the central executive a further check upon the abuse of their power by civil and military officials to the detriment of the provincials.

VI. The Master of the Offices and the *Scrinia*

The three secretarial bureaus, known as the *scrinia memoriae*, *epistularum*, and *libellorum*, which, in the *Notitia*,[4] are placed *sub dispositione magistri officiorum*, were most probably under the oversight of the Master from the time of the establishment of his office, certainly from the date of the enlargement of its competence under Constantine I.[5]

The Master exercised full authority over the organization and administration of the *scrinia*. The number of the clerks in each bureau, both of the *statuti* or regular employees and the *supernumerarii*, the admission to the service among the *statuti*, and the character of the duties to be performed by each of the latter, were under his supervision.[6] The roll of each *scrinium*, with the order of rank of its members, and all promotions were likewise under his care.[7] The Master also maintained the privileges and exemptions, judicial and otherwise, which the *scriniarii* enjoyed.[8]

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, VII, 8, 3 (384); VII, 8, 14 (427); VII, 8, 16 (435); *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 40, 2 (398); XII, 40, 8 (400); XII, 40, 9 (444); XII, 40, 10 (Valentinian and Marcian); XII, 40, 11 (Zeno). [2] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 40, 4.

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, VII, 8, *de metatis*; *Codex Justianinus*, XII, 40, id.

[4] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, *occ.* IX. [5] Cf. Chapter III, pp. 26–28.

[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 30, 3 (392); *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19. 7 (443–4); 9; (470); 10 (Leo); 11 (Athanasius).

[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 26, 6 (396); 11 (397); 17 (416); cf. *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 6. [8] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 9 (Leo); 12 (Anastasius); 14 (Justinus).

Digitized by Google

He also exercised judicial authority over those serving in the *scrinia;* at least from the time of Anastasius, neither they themselves, nor their parents, wives, children, nor even their slaves and *coloni* residing in Constantinople, could be prosecuted on civil or criminal charges except in accordance with a decision of the Master.[1]

From among those serving in these *scrinia* the Quaestor selected his aides (*adiutores*).[2] In the East the number of these *adiutores* had become fixed at twelve from the *scrinium memoriae* and seven from each of the *scrinia epistularum* and *libellorum*, whereas the total number in each of these bureaus was sixty-two, thirty-four, and thirty-four respectively.[3] However, this restriction had been disregarded and the number of the Quaestor's aides was threatening to equal the total number of the employees in each department, when Justinus took steps to reduce them to the former number.[4] The Master had to supervise this reduction and prevent the recurrence of similar circumstances in the future.[5] These *adiutores* of the Quaestor remained under the jurisdiction of the Master.[6]

Unlike the *scrinium dispositionum*, which, as we have seen, was entirely at the disposal of the Master of the Offices, the *scrinia memoriae, epistularum*, and *libellorum* performed only part of their functions under his orders. The direction of their services he shared with the Quaestor and the Magistri Scriniorum.

The titular head of each of the *scrinia* was a *magister* (ἀντιγραφεύς), who took his title from that department with which he was associated, as *magister memoriae, magister epistularum*, or *magister libellorum;* these officials were known collectively as the Magistri Scriniorum.[7] The Masters of the Scrinia had formerly been the active heads of their several departments, but after the Principate had passed into the Empire they had lost control over the personnel of these bureaus, having been in this respect super-

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 12 (Anastasius): *In sacris scriniis militantes et parentes atque uxores eorum nec non liberos ex sententia tantummodo tuae celsitudinis criminales et civiles intentiones agentium excipere iubemus, insuper etiam colonos seu adscripticios et servos eorum in hac regia urbe degentes eodem beneficio potiri.*

[2] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XII, *Officium non habet, sed adiutores de scriniis quos voluerit; occ.* X, *habet subaudientes adiutores memoriales de scriniis diversis.*

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 10 (Leo).

[4] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 13, cf. 15, § 1 (527).

[5] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 15. [6] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 14 (Justinus).

[7] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XIX, *occ.* XVII; *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 9.

Digitized by Google

seded by the Master of the Offices, and therefore merely commanding their services for certain purposes. However, unlike the *scriniarii* themselves, the Masters of the Scrinia were not subordinates of the Master of the Offices.[1]

As the Quaestor, the Master of the Offices, and the Masters of the Scrinia divided among them the control of the activities of the *scriniarii*, it remains to see for what purposes each could employ them.

First, then, let us consider the powers of the Masters of the Scrinia. These had no private *officium* but, like the Quaestor, had the right to draw aides from the *scrinia* to execute their orders.[2] With regard to the number of these aides we have no information. The *magister memoriae*, says the *Notitia*,[3] *adnotationes omnes dictat et emittit, et precibus respondet;* that is to say, he saw to the putting into proper form the verbal comments of the Emperor, which he despatched without the imperial signature. He also answered requests, *preces*, from individuals, and himself prepared these answers for the imperial approval, until Justinian[4] put an end to his independent action in judicial questions and placed him in this respect under the Quaestor's supervision. In view of the lack of an exact modern equipment for the title *magister memoriae*, on the basis of function and relation to the other Secretaries, we may venture to translate it as First Secretary.

The *magister epistularum*, or Secretary for Correspondence, dealt with the communications of legations from foreign states and from *civitates* within the Empire, with requests for advice from officials, and with certain petitions.[5] In the case of the legations the *magister epistularum* was doubtless subject to the supervision of the Master of the Offices, otherwise to that of the Quaestor.

[1] Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. I, pp. 833 ff.; Bury, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXI, p. 24; cf. *id.* vol. XXVI, pp. 101 ff.

[2] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XIX: *officium autem de ipsis nemo habet, sed adiutores electos de scriniis.* In the *N. D. occ.* XVII this is lacking, perhaps accidentally.

[3] *Or.* XIX; *occ.* XVII: *respondet tamen et precibus.*

[4] *Novellae Justiniani*, 114, 1.

[5] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XIX: *legationes civitatum, consultationes et preces tractat;* cf. *occ.* XVII. The activity of the *magister epistularum graecarum*, who existed only in the East, and who *eas epistolas, quae graece solent emitti, aut ipse dictat aut latine dictatas transfert in graecum* (*Notitia Dignitatum or.* XIX), does not require separate comment here. For the work of the *magister epistularum* see further *Codex Justinianus*, VII, 62, 32, 2 (440); 37 (529); 38 (*id.*); 63, 3 (518); *Novellae Justiniani*, 20 pr., where the *epistulares* act under his directions.

Digitized by Google

The Secretary for Petitions, *magister libellorum*, handled the cases, *cognitiones*, which were brought before the Emperor himself, and formulated independent rescripts in answer to petitions entered in other courts.[1] Here his work was subject to the Quaestor's revision.

The Quaestor was the official through whom the Emperor gave expression to his power as the source of law. The Quaestor consequently formulated laws and edicts, as well as answers to supplications requiring the imperial signature.[2] In dealing with supplications the Magistri Scriniorum, as we have seen, did most of the preparatory work, which was subject to the Quaestor's revision. The Quaestor had also the control of the *laterculum minus* or register of the subordinate officials of the Empire. For some time previous to 424 the *magistri militum* had usurped this right, but in that year the preparation of the list, which included the *praepositi*, *tribuni*, and the *praefecti castrorum*, was restored to the Quaestor.[3] Appointments to these offices were issued through the *scrinium memoriae*, which for this purpose was at the disposal of the Quaestor. This arrangement apparently concerned the East only, while in the West the *magister peditum praesentalis* continued to control the appointment of a great number of such officials, as at the time of the compilation of the *Notitia*.[4] For the preparation of the documents involved in the performance of his other duties the Quaestor, as we have seen, had in his service assistants drawn from the three *scrinia*.

The task of issuing the *probatoriae*, or imperial warrants entitling persons to be admitted to service in the various *officia*, both at the capital and throughout the provinces, was distributed among these three bureaus.[5] In this field the supervision of their activities fell to the lot of the Master of the Offices.[6] It was through the *scrinia* also that the notices of appointment were

[1] *Notitia Dignitatum or., occ., cognitiones et preces tractat*; cf. *Codex Justinianus*, III, 24, 3 pr.; VII, 62, 32, 4; *Novellae Justiniani*, 20, c. 9.

[2] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XII, *occ.* X, *leges dictandae, preces*; cf. Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, p. 833.

[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 8, 2 = *Codex Justinianus*, I, 30, 1: *Totius minoris laterculi curam scias ad tuae sublimitatis solicitudinem pertinere, ita ut tuo arbitrio ex scrinio memoriae totius minoris laterculi dignitates, hoc est praeposituraе omnes, tribunatus et praefecturae castrorum iuxta consuetudinem priscam clementiae meae auctoritate deinceps emittantur*; *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 8, 3 = *Codex Justinianus*, I, 30, 2.

[4] *Notitia Dignitatum occ.* XLII.

[5] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 59, 10 (Leo).

[6] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 59, 9 (Leo).

Digitized by Google

issued to the higher officials in the government service, and here, too, the Master was their superintendent, so that Cassiodorus [1] could say that no provincial judge was able to assume office without the sanction of the Master of the Offices.

In summary, then, the Master of the Offices had charge of the organization of the *scrinia*, and also of a part of their functions: the Masters of the Scrinia only commanded the services of selected *scriniarii* for specific purposes in which their work was generally subject to a revision by the Quaestor or the Master of the Offices: while the Quaestor on the one hand monopolized the services of a definite number of the clerks in each of these bureaus, and on the other, in connection with the care of the *laterculum minus*, directed the action of the *scrinium memoriae*. From this definition of the respective powers of these officers in connection with the *scrinia* it is now clear why the Master of the Offices was the recipient of imperial edicts regulating the relations of the Quaestor to the *scriniarii*,[2] and why it was at times found convenient to unite these two offices in the hands of one person.[3]

The connection of the Master and the *scrinia* was severed during the reorganization of the administration in the Eastern Empire in the seventh and following centuries. In the ninth century the *scrinia epistularum* and *libellorum* with their *magistri* or ἀντιγραφεῖς appear to be completely under the control of the Quaestor, while the *magister memoriae*, as the ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων, had attained an independent sphere of actions in the matter of petitions.[4]

VII. The Master of the Offices and the State Arsenals

Under Diocletian the control of the manufacture and distribution of weapons made in the state arsenals (*fabricae*) was centred at the court under an official called the *praepositus fabricarum* (?), a subordinate of the Pretorian Prefect.[5] Apparently

[1] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6: *His enim laboribus aestimatis potestatem maximam huic decrevit antiquitas, ut nemo iudicum per provincias fasces assumeret, nisi hoc et ipse fieri decrevisset.*

[2] As *Codex Justinianus*, I, 30, 2 = *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 8, 3; *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 30, 3; *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 15.

[3] As Trebonianus in 536, *Novellae Justiniani*, 33; Anastasius under Justinus II, Corippus, *Panegyr. pr.* 30.

[4] Bury, *Imperial Administration*, pp. 75–77.

[5] Seeck, *Pauly-Wissowa*, vol. 6, p. 1978.

Digitized by Google

under Constantine I this office disappeared, and the direction of the arsenals was placed in the hands of the Master of the Offices.[1] Lydus[2] connects this transfer with the fall of Rufinus in 395, although it had certainly taken place at an earlier date.[3] The correct interpretation of his statement probably is that Rufinus, following the example of various pretenders to the imperial throne,[4] during his brief period of power brought the *fabricae* under his control by restoring the control over them to the prefecture which he himself occupied, and that after his death they were put once more under the Master's supervision.[5] The earliest constitution that points to the Master's exercise of authority in this sphere dates from 390 A.D.[6]

This edict deals with the retirement and rank of the *primicerii fabricarum*, the seniors among the employees of the several arsenals, while subsequent constitutions of 398[7] and 404,[8] as well as one of Leo and Anthemius,[9] likewise show that the Master of the Offices had authority over the *corpus fabricensium*, or hereditary guild of armorers laboring in these *fabricae*. Matters of discipline, restrictions upon their freedom of movement, their relations with persons outside of their guild, and punishments for engaging in forbidden occupations, were under the Master's oversight. Consequently we find that it was upon the suggestion of the Master of the Offices that the guild of the *fabricenses* was held in corporate liability for the delinquencies of one of their number.[10]

Also, under Leo and Anthemius,[11] his jurisdiction over the *fabricenses*, their wives, and their sons, who were considered as serving in the ranks of the corporation, was made exclusive and they could be prosecuted in his court alone.

This power the Master continued to enjoy in the East under

[1] Seeck, *op. cit.*; see chap. III, p. 32.
[2] *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 3, 40.
[3] *Codex Theodosianus*, X, 22, 3 (390).
[4] Seeck, *Pauly-Wissowa*, vol. 6, p. 1926.
[5] Seeck, *op. cit.*, p. 1928; cf. chap. III, p. 36.
[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, X, 22, 3 = *Codex Justinianus*, XI, 10, 2.
[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, X, 22, 4 = *Codex Justinianus*, XI, 10, 3.
[8] *Codex Theodosianus*, X. 22, 5.
[9] *Codex Justinianus*, XI, 10, 7.
[10] *Novellae Theodosii*, 6, 2 (438); cf. *Codex Justinianus*, XI, 10, 5: *Universi itaque velut in corpore uniformi uni decoctioni, si ita res tulerit, respondere coguntur, ut viri inlustris et magnifici magistri officiorum suggestio nostrae clementiae patefecit.*
[11] *Codex Justinianus*, XI, 10, 6: *Eos, qui inter fabricenses sacrae fabricae sociati sunt vel eorum uxores aut filios, qui itidem inter fabricenses militare dicentur, non alibi pulsare volentibus respondere praecipimis, nisi in iudicio tuae sublimitatis, ad cuius iurisdictionem potestatemque pertinent.*

Digitized by Google

Justinian,[1] but in the Ostrogothic Kingdom it was restored to the Pretorian Prefect.[2]

To assist him in the supervision of the arsenals and armorers the Master had in his *officium* officials called *subadiuvae fabricarum*. Of these there were three in the East,[3] and in the West an indefinite number,[4] in the early part of the fifth century. In the East, under Leo, these *subadiuvae* constituted a separate bureau, or *scrinium*, within the *officium*, to which there were annually admitted for one year's service four Agentes of the rank of *princeps*.[5] This is evidently the same as the *scrinium fabricensium* which appears under Justinian.[6]

In the Orient there were sixteen state arsenals for the manufacture of weapons of various kinds, of which four were in the diocese of the Orient, three in the Pontic, one in the Asian, two in the Thracian, and four in the Illyrian diocese.[7] The Master in the Occident, at the same period of the fifth century, controlled twenty of these factories. They were located, five in Illyricum, six in Italy, and nine in Gaul.[8]

However, the manufacture of arms was not made an imperial monopoly until the time of Justinian, who in 539[9] absolutely prohibited the making of weapons by, or their sale to, civilians. This regulation was to be enforced by the Master of the Offices. It was his duty to appoint *cartularii*, or 'keepers of records' of the *scrinium fabricensium*, for whom five *priores* of the *scrinium* were responsible; to take depositions from *iudices* and their *officia*, and from *defensores* and *patres civitatis*, that they would not aid any one to do what was prohibited by this law; and personally to investigate contraventions thereof. The Master, furthermore, had the duty of making this edict known in the capital and throughout the provinces.[10]

The transport of the manufactured weapons from the arsenals to various points was also under the Master's care.[11] He notified

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, VI, 10, *de fabricensibus*; *Novellae Justiniani*, 85, 3.
[2] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 7, 18, 9.
[3] *Notitia Dignitatum, or.* XI, 34.
[4] *Notitia Dignitatum, occ.* IX, 43.
[5] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 20, 5: *Agentes in rebus, qui per ordinem consequi solent principatus insignia, in unoquoque scrinio fabricarum et barbarorum quarternos subadiuvarum solicitudinem per annum dumtaxat integrum procedentes gradatim subire hac in aeternum valitura lege decernimus.*
[6] *Novellae Justiniani*, 85, 3.
[7] *Notitia Dignitatum, or.* XI, 18–39.
[8] *Notitia Dignitatum, occ.* IX, 16–39.
[9] *Novellae Justiniani*, 39, 3.
[10] *Novellae Justiniani*, 3; 4.
[11] *Codex Justinianus*, XI, 10, 7.

Digitized by Google

the Prefect's office of the quantity to be transported, and the point of delivery, whereupon due provision had to be made by that office for the conveyance of the material specified, by land or sea, without delay, upon pain of a heavy penalty.[1]

The various *fabricae* were each under the immediate supervision of an official styled either *praepositus* or *tribunus*,[2] who was evidently a subordinate of the Master of the Offices, but whose relations to the latter are nowhere defined. These *praepositi* and *tribuni* were among those who made up the *laterculum minus*, which was under the care of the Quaestor;[3] they may have been nominated by him, or by the Master of the Offices, subject, in any case, to the imperial approval.[4]

In connection with the *fabricae* for the manufacture of weapons we have to consider imperial factories of another sort, those that were engaged in the production of goods interwoven with gold, pearls, and precious stones, which were reserved for the use of the imperial family. Such manufactures were a state monopoly from the time of Diocletian. The employees in these factories were called *barbaricarii*.[5] Under Valens, in the East, they were given the duty of decorating with gold and silver the helmets and shields of the soldiers,[6] and for this reason they, like the *fabricenses*, were placed under the control of the Master of the Offices.[7] In the West this transfer did not take place. To aid in the management of the factories served by the *barbaricarii*, the Master of the Offices had in his officium four assistants, called *subadiuvae barbaricariorum*.[8]

VIII. The Master of the Offices, the *Limites*, and the *Duces*

In the year 443 A.D. the Master of the Offices in the Eastern Empire was intrusted with the duty of preparing an annual report on the number of the soldiers (*limitanei*) on duty on certain of the frontiers (*limites*), as well as on the condition of the fortified camps and of the guard boats, which patrolled the river bound-

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XI, 10, 7. [2] Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 6, pp. 1927–8.
[3] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 30, 1 (424); cf. p. 85, above.
[4] They do not appear among the *praepositi* and *tribuni* nominated by the *magister peditum praesentalis* in the West, *Notitia Dignitatum*, *occ.* XLII.
[5] Seeck, *Pauly-Wissowa*, vol. 2, pp. 2856–7.
[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, X, 22, 1 (324). [7] Seeck, *op. cit.*
[8] *Notitia Dignitatum*, *or.* IX, 45.

Digitized by Google

aries. The *limites* specified were those of Thrace, Illyricum, the Orient, Pontus, Egypt, Thebes, and Libya; that is, practically all the borders of the Eastern Empire.[1] The report was to be delivered in the imperial *consistorium* during the month of January on the Master's own initiative.[2]

Under Justinian this duty was still performed by the Master. However, the frontiers which he then inspected are not specified, but are simply referred to as all those placed under his jurisdiction; and the report is not assigned to any definite time nor place, being given solely upon the Master's initiative.[3] Still, the actual care and repair of the fortified camps and guardboats, and the command of the *limitanei*, remained in the hands of the *duces limitum*, who were under the supervision of the *magistri militum*.[4]

The reason which caused this inspection of the frontier defences to be intrusted to the Master of the Offices may be gathered from the general content of the edict of Theodosius II.[5] It was evidently the desire to obtain a credible report on the condition of the defences of the Empire through an official who was not directly concerned with their construction, maintenance, and garrisoning. This involved the use of an official of the civil administration as a check upon military officers; and for the performance of this task there was none more suitable than the Master of the Offices, the director of the *agentes in rebus*. The Master of the Offices in the Occident did not receive this power, probably on account of the exceptional influence of the *magister peditum praesentalis* at Rome.[6]

The right of the Master to inspect the *limites* led to the con-

[1] *Novellae Theodosii*, 24, 5: *Id autem curae perpetuae tui culminis credimus iniungendum, ut tam Thracici quam Inlyrici nec non etiam Orientalis ac Pontici limitis, Aegyptiaci insuper Thebaici Libyci quemadmodum se militum numerus habeat castrorumque ac lusoriarum cura procedat, quotannis mense Ianuario in sacro consistorio significare nobis propria suggestione procures.* [2] *Novellae Theodosii*, 24, 5.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 4: *Curae perpetuae tui culminis credimus iniungendum, ut super omni limite sub tua iurisdictione constituto, quemadmodum se militum numerus habeat castrorumque ac clusurarum cura procedat, quotannis significare nobis propria suggestione procuret.*

[4] *Novellae Theodosii*, 24, 1 (cf. *Codex Justinianus*, I, 46, 4): *Imprimis itaque duces limitum et praecipue, quibus gentes quae maxime cavendae sunt adpropinquant, in ipsis limitibus commorari et milites ad proprium redigere numerum, inminentibus magisteriis potestatibus diuturnisque eorum exercitationibus inhaerere praecipimus.*

[5] *Novellae Theodosii* 24, 5: *ut uniuscuiusque tam industria quam desidia nostris auribus intimata, et strenui digna praemia consequantur et in dissimulatores competens indignatio proferatur.*

[6] Cf. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXVI, pp. 124 f., 144 f.

Digitized by Google

ferring upon him of judicial authority over their defenders. This jurisdiction Leo made exclusive, removing the *duces* and their *apparitores*, the *limitanei* and the *praepositi castrorum* from the jurisdiction of any other than the Master,[1] subject only to the respecting of certain indefinite privileges previously enjoyed by the *magistri militum* in relation to the frontiers of the Orient, Thrace, and Illyricum.

Justinian directed that all appeals coming from the court of a *dux*, no matter what the rank of the judge officiating there, should be settled by the Master of the Offices and the Quaestor acting together.[2] For this reason the code of Justinian speaks of the *limites* under the Master's jurisdiction.[3]

The Master's supervision of the frontiers did not survive the reform of the military organization of the Empire and the creation of the *themes* in the seventh century.

IX. The Master of the Offices and the Imperial Consistory

From about the year 325 A.D. the Master of the Offices was a *comes consistorianus*,[4] that is to say a standing member of the *consistorium*, or Imperial Privy Council, which was composed of a select number of the high administrative officers of the Empire, in addition to extraordinary members summoned from time to time as the occasion demanded; this consistory acted as a council of state for the settlement of questions of policy beyond the competence of the various individual officials and as a high court of justice on special occasions.[5] This participation in the highest councils of the state added to the prestige and influence of the Master's office, and the part which he played there reflected the character of the various departments of the administration which were under his control.

We have already made mention of one of the Master's duties in connection with the *consistorium*, namely the obligation to

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 59, 8: *Viros spectabiles duces eorumque apparitores nec non limitaneos castrorumque praepositos tantummodo ex sublimis tui iudicii sententia conveniri nec aliis subiacere iudicibus praecipimus: illustribus scilicet ac magnificis viris magistris militum consuetudine ac potestate, si qua ad limites aliquos Orientis Thraciarum et Illyrici ex longo tempore hactenus obtinuit, reservata.*

[2] *Codex Justinianus*, VII, 62, 38 (529).

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 4.

[4] Cf. p. 31.

[5] Karlowa, *Roemische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, pp. 848 ff.; Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, vol. 4, p. 931; Reid, *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, vol. 1, p. 48.

Digitized by Google

present there his annual report upon the condition of the frontier defences of the provinces.[1] Further interesting evidence regarding the presence of the Master at the sessions of this Council is afforded by the record of part of the proceedings of a meeting called by the Emperor Julian, contained in a constitution of 362, the prelude of which contains the words *in consistorio, adstante Jovio, viro clarissimo, quaestore, Anatolio, magistro officioru(m), Felice, com(iti) sacrarum largitionum.*[2]

The Master of the Offices arranged all the imperial audiences, both of private persons, of officials, and of ambassadors from foreign states, which were usually held in the *consistorium.* In this he was assisted by the *officium admissionum*, the corps of court ushers (*admissionales*) with the *magister admissionum* at their head, who were subject to his orders.[3]

Cassiodorus, whose *formula* of the Master's office[4] lays special stress upon this aspect of his duties, informs us that it was he who introduced the senators to the royal presence, and directed them in their deportment and speech.[5] It was the Master who promised an audience, who granted admission to the *consistorium*, and, as the morning star foretold the coming day, so he heralded the prospect of seeing the royal countenance.[6]

Persons to be presented might be actually introduced by an ordinary *admissionalis*, or by the *magister admissionum.*[7] In the case of men of eminence, such as senators, the Master himself might stand before the curtain (*velum*) of the council chamber and usher in the favored individuals.[8] In this latter fashion the Bishop Athanasius seems to have been brought before the Emperor Constans in 346,[9] and the monk Constantius before Theodosius II in 449.[10]

[1] *Novellae Theodosii*, 24, 1; 5; cf. *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 4.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 39, 5.

[3] *Notitia Dignitatum, or.* XI, 17; *occ.* IX, 14; sect. 2 above. [4] *Variae*, 6, 6.

[5] Cassiodorus, *loc. cit.: Per eum senator veniens nostris praesentatur obtutibus; admonet trepidum; componit loquentem; sua quin etiam verba solet inserere, ut nos decenter omnia debeamus audire.*

[6] Cassiodorus, *loc. cit.: Aspectus regi haud irritus, promissor collocutionis nostrae, gloriosus donator aulici consistorii, quasi quidem lucifer; nam sicut ille venturum diem promittit, sic iste desiderantibus vultus nostrae serenitatis attribuit.*

[7] Ammianus, 15, 5, 8: *per magistrum admissionum, qui mos est honoratior, accito.*

[8] Valesius on Ammianus 26, 5, 7; Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6; *De Caer.*, 1, 87.

[9] *Apolog. ad Constantinum*, 3: δύναται καὶ Εὐγένιος ὁ γενόμενος μάγιστρος μαρτυρῆσαι· αὐτὸς γὰρ εἱστήκει πρὸ τοῦ βήλου καὶ ἤκουεν ἅπερ ἠξιοῦμεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἅπερ αὐτὸς κατηξίου λέγειν ἡμᾶς. [10] Mansi, vol. 6, p. 821.

Digitized by Google

Representatives of foreign countries were under the care of the Master of the Offices from the time they crossed the Roman borders. He provided their escort, received and entertained them, introduced them to the Emperor, gave them suitable presents, and upon their departure provided them with a safe-conduct.[1] Ammianus[2] records that in 365 the ambassadors of the Alemanni, having rejected as unworthy the gifts offered to them, were treated with asperity by Ursatius, then Master of the Offices, and withdrew to stir up war.

The poet Corippus[3] has left a description of the introduction of the ambassadors of the Avars into the presence of Justin II by the Master in 566; and the Roman usage that legates should declare the object of their mission to the Master of the Offices first of all is indicated by the refusal of the Roman representatives sent to the Persian court in 579 to deliver their message to any one except that official whom the Romans styled the Master.[4] Further, Priscus[5] relates that when, in 448, Theodosius II was party to a plot to assassinate Attila, after corrupting one of the latter's ambassadors, he sent for Martinalius, his Master of the Offices, and informed him of the arrangements; the latter was entitled, through his official position, to know them. The Master, he says, "shared in all the Emperor's counsels, because he had at his orders the Agentes, the interpreters, and the soldiers of the palace guard," thus giving the grounds for the Master's presence in the consistory, and his connection with the diplomatic relations of the Empire.

The *Ceremonial Book* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus has preserved an account of the procedure customary in the fifth century at the court of Constantinople in the reception of embassies from an Emperor in the Occident, who had not yet

[1] As Cassiodorus (*Variae*, 6, 6) phrases it: *Per eum exteris gentibus ad laudem rei publicae nostrae ordinatur humanitas, et nolentes redeunt quos merentes exceperit: per eum quippe nobis legatorum quamvis festinantium praenuntiatur adventus.*

[2] Ammianus, 26, 5, 7.

[3] *In laudem Justini*, III, 231 ff.:

> Legatos Avarum jussos intrare magister
> Ante fores sacras divinae nuntiat aulae
> Orantes sese vestigia sacra videre
> Clementis domini, quos voce et mente benigna
> Imperat admissi.

[4] Menander Protector, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, p. 257, fr. 55.

[5] *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, p. 77, fr. 7.

Digitized by Google

been acknowledged by the Emperor in the Orient; it also sets forth the custom followed in the case of embassies from the Persian court.

On occasions of the former sort,[1] the Master had to provide for the entertainment of the legates, receive them, and arrange for their audience. If the legate were himself a Master of the Offices, he was brought to the palace by the *adiutor* of the Master at the court of Constantinople; otherwise by members of the *officium admissionum*. The legate or legates attended in the hall of the Master (σχολὴ τοῦ μαγίστρου) in the palace until the time of their reception. After the Eastern Emperor had confirmed the appointment of his Western colleague, legates of the rank of Prefect were placed upon an equal footing with the Prefects in Constantinople, but those who were Masters gave precedence to the Master in the East.[2] This procedure was also followed in the case of similar delegations from the Gothic Kings of Italy.[3]

Prior to their farewell reception the Master of the Offices had to prepare a list of presents for the legates and their attendants, which, when approved by the Emperor, he turned over to the Count of the Sacred Largesses to make ready. Finally, the Master took any letters from the Eastern to the Western Emperor and handed them over to the ambassadors, when they came to take leave of him.[4]

When a Persian legate visited Constantinople, the Master's duties were still more onerous.[5] He had to send a representative to the border city of the Empire, Nisibis, to greet him, to present a written or oral invitation to visit the capital, and to convoy him on his way thither. The *officiales* of the *duces* in the provinces traversed had to provide the requisites for the journey and a record of these expenditures was kept in the bureau of foreigners, *scrinium barbarorum*, which formed a part of the Master's *officium*. As the legate approached Antioch he was met by one of the Agentes sent by the Master to exchange courtesies. Again, at Chalcedon, the Master had to have quarters ready for him and his retinue, to send him an adjutant from the *scrinium*

[1] *De Caer.*, I, 87; 88.

[2] *De Caer.*, I, 87: ὁ ἔπαρχος τῶν πραιτωρίων καὶ ὁ ἔπαρχος τῆς πόλεως, λοιπὸν οὕτως δέχονται ὡς ἐνταῦθα ὄντες ἔπαρχοι, . . ., καὶ ὁ μάγιστρος μετὰ τὸν μαγίστρον τὸν ἐνταῦθα περιπατεῖ.

[3] *De Caer.*, I, 87 fin.

[4] *De Caer.*, I, 88.

[5] *De Caer.*, I, 89, 90.

Digitized by Google

barbarorum (ὀπτίων τῶν βαρβάρων), to furnish the cost of his sojourn there and offer him presents, and to send others to greet him again and to inquire whether his journey had been made pleasantly and without annoyance. A residence with due furnishings had to be provided for the ambassador in Constantinople, to the preparation of which the Count of the Private Purse or the Saccellarius of the Emperor and the Urban Prefect made contributions according to a written order from the Master.

To meet the legate on his arrival at the European shore the Master sent horses from the imperial stables under the direction of the Emperor's *spatharius*. When he reached his quarters the Master again sent him greetings and presents. This greeting was returned by a representative of the legate. The legate next visited the Master himself, who received him with polite formalities and later notified him through a *subadiuva* of his office of the date set for his audience with the Emperor. In preparing for the reception, the *magister admissionum* ascertained the Master's pleasure with regard to the standard-bearers (λαβαρήσιοι) and gave them their orders. The Master then received the legate in his audience hall, asked about the number of presents that the latter brought, and took a list of them, which he presented to the Emperor. The *candidati* and their attendants, the *admissionales*, the *chartularii* of the *scrinium barbarorum*, and the interpreters took up their respective posts and executed their duties at the Master's command. It was the Master who summoned the legate to the *consistorium*. Later an evaluation of the presents brought by the legate was made and given to the Master, who used it in advising the Emperor as to the gifts to be made in return.

At the Master's word the guard of the *candidati* was dismissed and the legate awaited the Master in the latter's hall until he came to close the interview. Subsequently, the Emperor signified to the Master of the Offices that he was ready to grant another audience, whereupon the latter notified the legate, received him, and introduced him as before. Upon this occasion private gifts of the legate were received through the Master, who also dismissed the former at the close of the ceremony. Further, as the Emperor thought best, he allowed the Master alone to discuss business of state with the legate, or permitted other officials to do the same.

On account of his duties in connection with such embassies,

Digitized by Google

and likewise for the purpose of handling diplomatic correspondence with foreign peoples, the Master of the Offices had in his *officium* a body of interpreters, known as *interpretes diversarum gentium*.[1] However, correspondence with legations coming from within the Empire was transacted through the *scrinium epistularum*.[2]

The Master of the Offices himself was sometimes employed as a Roman legate to foreign nations; his position in the confidence of the Emperor, and the influence which his office lent him in the conduct of foreign affairs, rendered him well suited for such missions. Thus, in 456, Euphemius, Master under Marcian, went on an embassy to Gobazes, King of the Lazi in the Caucasus, and persuaded him to make peace with the Romans.[3] In 522, Hermogenes, another Master, was a Roman representative at the Persian court;[4] and ten years later Celer, also a Master, concluded a peace for seven years with the same foe.[5] In 555 and 562 Petrus, Master under Justinian, likewise negotiated treaties with the Persians.[6] In 579, Tiberius sent his Master of the Offices, Theodorus, as a legate to Chosroes II,[7] and as late as 774 A.D. a Master named Petrus, in company with the Logothete of the Post and the Domesticus, went on an embassy to make terms with the Arabs.[8]

In addition to representing the imperial interests on diplomatic missions, the Master of the Offices was appointed to undertake other extraordinary services, for which his position in the consistorium particularly fitted him. For example, in 360, Florentius, Master under Constantius, was nominated one of the two officials forming a commission to investigate the loss of Amida.[9] A little later, Julian sent his Master, Pentadius, on a confidential mission to Constantius.[10] In exceptional cases a Master of the Offices was even intrusted with a high military command, as when Justinian,

[1] *Notitia Dignitatum, or.* XI, 52; *omnium gentium, occ.* X, 46; cf. Priscus, *Fragmenta Historiorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, p. 77, fr. 7; *De Caer.*, 1, 89. [2] Cf. p. 84 above.

[3] Priscus, c. 12, p. 155, Bonn: ὥστε δὲ θάτερον βασιλεύειν, Γοβάζην, ἢ τὸν αὐτοῦ παῖδα, τῆς Κολχίδος, καὶ τῇδε λυθῆναι τὸν πόλεμον, Εὐφήμιος ἐσηγήσατο, τὴν τοῦ μαγίστρου διέπων ἀρχήν. [4] Theophanes, 276 Bonn.

[5] Procopius, *De bello Persico*, 1, 8.

[6] Theophanes, 370, Bonn: cf. Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, 4, 11; Menander Protector, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, p. 207, fr. 11.

[7] Menander Protector, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*, vol. 4, p. 257, fr. 55; Theophylactus, 3, 15.

[8] Theophanes, 706, Bonn. [9] Ammianus, 20, 2, 2.

[10] Ammianus, 20, 8, 19.

Digitized by Google

in 532, sent his Master Celer as one of the four generals in command of the forces destined for the relief of Amida,[1] and later appointed Hermogenes to a joint command with Belisarius.[2]

It is also probable that the exercise of judicial functions by the Master in special cases, where honorary *illustres* resident in Constantinople were concerned,[3] was due to his presence in the *consistorium.*

The importance and influence, in the state, of the position occupied by the Master of the Offices, is further illustrated by the prominent rôle that he carried at the accession and inauguration of the Emperors Leo I (457), Leo II (474), Anastasius (491), and Justin I (518), accounts of which are to be found in the Ceremonial Book.[4] In the latter instance,[5] upon the death of Anastasius, who did not leave an Empress surviving to nominate a successor, and who had neglected to make such a nomination himself or to take a colleague during his lifetime, the first persons notified were the Master, Celer, and the Commander of the *excubitores*, Justinus. The former convened the Scholarians and the *candidati;* the latter the regular soldiers, tribunes, *vicarii* and officers of the *excubitores*, and each announced the need of choosing a new Emperor. In the meeting of the senate which followed Celer played a leading part; his exhortation to the dignitaries is the only one preserved, and it was this body that finally nominated Justinus.

Even after the Master's office had lost its immediate control over the various departments of the administration, it continued to be one of the great offices of state, whose holder assisted in the imperial councils and in the general government of the Empire. In such capacity under Theophilus and Basil I the Master officiated as one of the three dignitaries who conducted the government during the absence of the Emperor from the capital. His associates upon such occasions were the Viceroy (ὁ διέπων), who was regularly the Praepositus, and the Urban Prefect.[6] These duties remained the longest with the Mastership; even after it had become an order of rank, as late as the reign of Basil I, the two Masters, who still performed some duties as the

[1] Procopius, *De bello Persico*, I, 8.

[2] Procopius, *op. cit.*, I, 13: ξυνδιακομήσων τὸν στρατόν; cf. Müller, *Philologus*, 1912, p. 107.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, III, 24, 3.

[4] *De Caer.*, I, 91; 92; 93; 94.

[5] *De Caer.*, I, 93.

[6] *De Caer.*, appendix (περι ταξεων) 503, 504, 506, Bonn; cf. p. 54 above.

Digitized by Google

Emperor's advisers, were accordingly known as the "Masters of the State." [1]

The duties of the Master in connection with the introduction of officials to the imperial presence, as well as in receiving and presenting foreign ambassadors, passed to the Logothete of the Post, whom we find performing them in the tenth century.[2]

X. The Ceremonial Duties of the Master of the Offices

The position of the Master of the Offices as commander of the Palace Guards and director of the various corps of palace servants, especially that of the court ushers, who, as we have seen, were under his orders, naturally rendered him responsible for the part which they played at the various court ceremonies where their presence was required. Hence he came to assume control over the ceremonial on such occasions, and to take over the function of a Master of Ceremonies. This is clearly indicated in the account given by Corippus[3] of an audience in the palace where, upon the Emperor's command, the various corps of *officiales palatini* took up their respective positions according to the Master's orders.

A large part of the ceremonial duties fell to the lot of the Master in connection with the audiences held in the council chamber (*consistorium*), where delegates from foreign peoples, senators, and other persons, who for various reasons were accorded an official interview with the Emperor, were received. The Master's share in such proceedings has been amply illustrated in the discussion of his duties in connection with the *Consistory* and requires no further comment here.

There were other official ceremonies, however, at which the Master had a similar part to play. One of these was the inaugu-

[1] Theophanes Continuatus, 5, 99: τοῖς δυσὶ τῆς πολιτείας μαγίστροις, whom the Emperor desired to intrust with the direction of the survey of lands which had become ownerless, and their reassignment.

[2] *De Caer.*, 1, 24, 138 Bonn; 2, 3; 2, 15; 2, 47; Luitprand, *Historia*, 6, 2: *imperator non voce sua, sed per logothetam, cum legatis loquitur.*

[3] *In laudem Justini*, III, 162 ff.:

> Ornata est Augusta domus, iussuque regentis
> Acciti proceres omnes, schola quaeque palati est
> Iussa suis adstare locis. Iamque ordine certo
> Turba decanorum, cursorum, in rebus agentum,
> Cumque palatinis stans candida turba tribunis
> Et protectorum numerus mandante magistro.

Digitized by Google

ration of a new Emperor, regarding which the book On Ceremonies has preserved several notices. From it we learn that at the induction of Leo I the Master of the Offices, Martialius, and the archbishop of Constantinople, Anatolius, were the two chief personages.[1] At the coronation of Leo II, also, the Master had a prominent part; with the assistance of certain Patricians, he introduced the Caesar who was to be crowned.[2] The Master, likewise, had charge of the introduction of Anastasius upon the occasion of his assumption of the imperial title.[3]

The prominent rôle assumed by the Master Celer in connection with the choice of a successor to Anastasius, in 518, has already been discussed.[4] We know further that at Justin's inauguration it was the duty of the Quaestor, or of Celer himself, to read the address of the new Emperor to the people; but the former was absent from the ceremony, and the latter had in the meantime suffered an attack of gout, so that some member of the Bureau of Petitions, *scrinium libellorum*, had to take his place.[5] In the account given of the coronation of Leo II the Master of the Offices is mentioned along with the *consul ordinarius* as an eponymous official;[6] in that of the coronation of Justinian he is the only official mentioned in connection with the dating of the event.[7]

Further, in the sixth century the Master had important ceremonial duties to perform at the appointment of officers to higher posts, or at their admission to the imperial service, especially when they were under the orders of the Master himself, as in the case of the *comes admissionum*[8] or *candidati*.[9]

The general functions of the Master of the Offices as a Master of Ceremonies gradually passed to the Praepositus and to the officer known as the ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως, or Master of Ceremonies. To the transitional stage of this process is to be attributed the procedure recorded for three functions in the *De Caerimoniis*.

[1] *De Caer.*, 1, 91; they alone, of all the dignitaries, are mentioned by name.

[2] *De Caer.*, 1, 94. [3] *De Caer.*, 1, 92. [4] See p. 92 ff. above.

[5] *De Caer.* 1, 93.

[6] *De Caer.*, 1, 94: τῇ οὖν πρὸ δεκαπέντε καλανδῶν Δεκεμβρίων ἐν ὑπατίᾳ Λέοντος τοῦ μικροῦ, μαγίστρου ὄντος Εὐσεβίου.

[7] *De Caer.*, 1, 95: τῇ οὖν τετάρτῃ τοῦ Ἀπριλίου μηνὸς ἰνδέ, μαγίστρου ὄντος Ταταιανοῦ. The prominent position thus given to the Mastership may be due to the partiality of the Master Petrus with whom these accounts originated, and whose work on this office has been referred to before; cf. Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 25.

[8] *De Caer.*, 1, 84. [9] *De Caer.*, 1, 86.

Digitized by Google

The first of these is the appointment of a Caesar,[1] and dates from a time when there were several Masters, forming a grade of dignitaries.[2] Here the Praepositus and the First Master (ὁ πρῶτος μάγιστρος) are charged with the duty of introducing the future Caesar. The second case is that of celebrations held in the Golden Hippodrome,[3] and the third that of the races held on the anniversary of the foundation of Constantinople.[4] The rôle of the Master is the same in both cases. In admitting the senate and the ex-Prefect to their places the Emperor gave the signal to the Praepositus, who nodded to the Master, who in turn signalled to the Master of Ceremonies, ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως, who summoned the dignitaries. In these latter instances, however, it was the Praepositus and the Master of Ceremonies who really had charge of the arrangements of the celebrations; the share of the Master of Offices was now purely nominal, a relic of his former importance.

In later ceremonies of the ninth and tenth centuries the Masters take no active part whatever.

XI. The *Officium* of the Master of the Offices

The Master of the Offices, like the other important administrative officials, had his *officium*. This was an office staff of clerks, secretaries, and the like, who kept the Master in touch with the various departments of the palace and the administration that were under his control, aiding him in the work of supervision; they also assisted him in the performance of the general duties that fell to his lot.

According to the *Notitia*[5] the *officium* of the Master in the Orient was composed of the following officials, who were chosen from the *schola* of the Agentes in Rebus:

An Aide, *adiutor*.

Two Assistant Aides, *subadiuvae adiutores*.

Three Deputies for the Arsenals, *subadiuvae fabricarum*.

Four Deputies for the Textile Factories, *subadiuvae barbaricariorum*.

A Resident Inspector of the State Post, *curiosus cursus publici praesentalis*.

[1] *De Caer.*, I, 43.
[2] βῆλον ά, τοὺς μαγίστρους.
[3] *De Caer.*, I, 68.
[4] *De Caer.*, I, 70.
[5] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 40: *Officium autem suprascripti viri illustris magistri officiorum de scola agentum in rebus est ita.*

Digitized by Google

Inspectors, *curiosi*, throughout all the provinces.

Interpreters of various nations.

The same source gives the *officium* of the Master in the Occident, likewise recruited from among the Agentes, as follows:[1]

An Aide, *adiutor*.

Assistants to the Aide, *subadiuvae adiutoris*.

Deputies for the different Arsenals, *subadiuvae fabricarum diversarum*.

One Resident Inspector of the State Post, *curiosus cursus publici in praesenti*.

Inspectors, *curiosi*, for all the provinces.

Interpreters of all nations.

In addition to the above-mentioned officials each *officium* had a number of clerks for the performance of office work of various kinds, who were under the direction of the *adiutor* and *subadiuvae*.

The *adiutor*, or Master's aide, was in control of the *officium*, and likewise of the whole *schola* of the Agentes,[2] which in a certain sense might be regarded as a larger *officium*. His position corresponded to that of the *principes* in the other *officia*. The *adiutor* was selected among the Agentes of the rank of *ducenarius*,[3] by the Master himself, but his appointment was subject to the imperial confirmation.[4] Originally, the whole *schola* of the Agentes was called upon to testify as to his fitness for the post, but later this formality was dispensed with.[5] Upon his retirement he took rank with the *vicarii*,[6] and at the end of the fifth century was a *clarissimus*[7] when in the active service.

The *scrinium* of the *adiutor*, that is the body of clerks at his disposal, is also mentioned, and in such terms as to indicate that

[1] *Notitia Dignitatum occ.* IX, 40.

[2] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 9, 1 (359): *Adiutor praeterea, in quo totius scholae status et magistri securitas constituta est.*

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 21, 5 (440–441).

[4] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 9, 1: *Adiutor praeterea, . . . , omni schola testimonium praebente, idoneus probitate morum ac bonis artibus praeditus nostris per magistrum obtutibus offeratur, ut nostro ordinetur arbitrio*; cf. *Cod. Just.* 1, 31, 1; Cass. *var.* 6, 6, 8.

[5] Compare *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 9, 1 with *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 1, where the phrase *omni schola* etc. is omitted.

[6] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 21, 5: *Eos, qui ordine transcursa militia post ducenam ad desideratum principis pervenerint gradum aut adiutores viri illustris magistri officiorum extiterint, cum inter honoratos coeperint numerari, vicarianae dignitatis titulis decorari censemus.*

[7] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 12 (Zeno); XII, 29, 2 (474); *C. I. L.* VIII, 989.

Digitized by Google

it had charge of the documents relating to cases brought against the *scriniarii* who were under the Master's jurisdiction.[1]

It was the *adiutor* who, as Bury[2] thinks, subsequently developed into the *domesticus scholarum*, the officer that later superseded the Master as commander of the Scholarians. However, this point will be discussed more fully in connection with the *domesticus* of the Master.

The *subadiuvae adiutores*,[3] or *adiutoris*,[4] were the aides of the *adiutor* and probably assisted him in the general direction of the office. In the ceremonial followed in connection with the reception of a Persian ambassador at Constantinople it was one of these *subadiuvae* whom the Master sent to notify the legate of the time set for his audience.[5]

The *subadiuvae fabricarum*, as their name indicates, were occupied with the business arising from the Master's control of the arsenals. In the early fifth century there were three of them in the office of the Eastern Master,[6] but apparently a greater number in the West.[7] Later, however, the number in the East was increased; for under Leo[8] four *subadiuvae* from the highest class of the Agentes were annually chosen for a year's service in the *scrinium fabricarum*. Evidently the *scrinium fabricarum* consisted of these *subadiuvae* and the clerks under their orders. In 539 it still formed part of the Master's *officium*, and the latter was then directed to appoint *chartularii* therefrom to investigate contraventions of the edict forbidding the manufacture of arms by private persons, while five seniors (*priores*) of the *scrinium* were responsible for the acts of these deputies.[9]

The four *subadiuvae barbaricariorum* in the Orient occupied a position closely corresponding to that held by the *subadiuvae fabricarum*. They assisted the Master in the supervision of the imperial factories for the making of goods interwoven with gold, pearls, and precious stones, in which the workmen were styled *barbaricarii*. From the time of Valens such factories in the

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 19, 12, 3.
[2] *Imperial Administration*, p. 50.
[3] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 42–3.
[4] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* IX, 42.
[5] *De Caer.*, 1, 89.
[6] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 44.
[7] *Notitia Dignitatum occ.* IX, 43.
[8] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 20, 5: *Agentes in rebus, qui per ordinem consequi solent principatus insignia, in unoquoque scrinio fabricarum et barbarorum quaternos subadiuvarum sollicitudinem per annum dumtaxat integrum proceder tes gradatim subire hac in aeternum valitura lege decernimus.*
[9] *Novellae Justiniani*, 85, c. 3; cf. p. 88 above.

Digitized by Google

unless we suppose that they had later received a sphere of duties differing widely from those which they originally performed. The probabilities are, therefore, that some time after the compilation of the *Notitia* a new *scrinium*, that in question, was added to the *officium* of the Master.

The Inspector of the Post at the Court — the *curiosus cursus publici praesentalis*,[1] or *in praesenti*[2] — evidently had charge of the passes for the State Post issued in the Master's *officium*, and probably of those issued in the name of the Emperor also; for the title *praesentalis* seems to suggest his connection with the imperial person. The other Inspectors of the Post, those despatched throughout the provinces, the *curiosi per omnes provincias*[3] or *omnium provinciarum*,[4] whose duties have been explained elsewhere,[5] were likewise reckoned as forming part of the Master's office.

Lastly, there were the interpreters for the foreign peoples with whom the Empire entered into official contact,[6] who were of assistance to the Master in his conduct of diplomatic correspondence or personal negotiations with foreign governments or their representatives.[7]

The members of the Master's *officium*, upon the expiration of their term of service, were accorded the rank of *princeps*, taking precedence over those from the offices of the Pretorian and the Urban Prefects.[8] This general statement is exclusive of the *adiutor*, whose special honors have been mentioned.

This office staff gradually broke up, as the various departments, in the direction of which they had assisted the Master, passed from his hands into those of others; it disappeared entirely when the Master ceased to be an active administrative official.

XII. The *Domesticus* of the Master of the Offices

Besides the members of his Staff, *officium*, the Master of the Offices had in his service an officer called a *domesticus*. Such

[1] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 50.
[2] *Notitia Dignitatum occ.* IX, 44.
[3] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 51.
[4] *Notitia Dignitatum occ.* IX, 45.
[5] See p. 74 ff. above.
[6] *Notitia Dignitatum or.* XI, 52: *interpretes diversarum gentium*; *occ.* IX, 46: *omnium gentium*.
[7] Priscus, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 4, p. 77, fr. 7; *De Caer.*, 1, 89.
[8] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6, 7: *Officium vero eius tanta genii praerogativa decoratur, ut militiae perfunctus muneribus ornetur nomine principatus miroque modo inter praetorianas cohortes et urbanae praefecturae milites videantur invenisse primatum.*

Digitized by Google

early regal period of Rome, is pure fantasy; and the difficulty which modern writers find in choosing a title to translate that of the Master is further proof of the uniqueness of his position.

A few of these attempts at correlation may be mentioned. Hodgkin[1] thinks that a combination of the offices of the principal Secretaries of State of Great Britain, united with that of a Private Secretary to the Sovereign, would correspond closely with the functions of the Master of the Offices. Serrigny[2] views him as a *ministre de la police générale*, acting as a guard over the other ministers. Again, Bouché-Leclercq[3] translates Master of the Offices by *prévôt de palais*, and Schiller[4] uses a corresponding term, Oberhofmarschall, which, in turn, is not very different from Madvig's Reichshofmeister.[5]

Although there does not seem to have been any definitely established *cursus honorum* necessarily preceding the holding of the Mastership of the Offices, still from the official careers of some of the Masters known to us, which may be regarded as typical examples, one can infer the general nature of the official training which was a prelude to the appointment. Naturally this was of a civil and not of a military character, as may be clearly seen from the list of offices filled by the two Masters whose careers are most fully known, Flavius Eugenius, Master in 346, and Cassiodorus, Master between 523 and 527. Prior to his Mastership, Eugenius, as an inscription[6] shows, had been employed in the various subordinate offices about the palace; Cassiodorus held in succession the following posts: Conciliarius of the Pretorian Prefect, Quaestor, Corrector of Apulia and Bruttium, Consul Ordinarius, Master of the Offices, and Pretorian Prefect.[7]

In the fourth century Masters of the Offices were often chosen among those who had filled secretaryships and clerkships, even as members of the staff of other officials. Thus Anatolius[8] was promoted from the Secretaryship of the Petitions, Felix,[9] Leo,[10]

[1] *Italy and her Invaders*, Vol. I, 2, p. 610.
[2] *Droit public romain*, p. 87.
[3] *Manuel des Institutions romaines*, p. 165.
[4] *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Vol. 2, p. 101.
[5] *Verfassung des römischen Staates*, vol. I, 1, p. 587.
[6] Dessau, *Inscriptiones Selectae*, 1244; FL(avio) EUGENIO, V(iro) C(larissimo), EX PRAEFECTO PRAETORIO, CONSULI ORDINARIO DESIGNATO, MAGISTRO OFFICIORUM OMNIUM, COMITI DOMESTICO ORDINIS PRIMI OMNIBUSQUE PALATINIS DIGNITATIBUS FUNCTO, etc.
[7] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, vol. XII, pp. x–xi.
[8] Ammianus, 20, 9, 8 (360), *libellis respondens*.
[9] Ammianus, 20, 9, 5 (360).
[10] Ammianus, 28, 1, 12 (368).

Digitized by Google

Syagrius[1] and Johannes[2] from *notarii;* and Remigius[3] from a clerkship in the office of a *magister militum.*

At this time the Mastership might be a step to a provincial governorship of the highest rank, as in the case of Ampelius,[4] who was advanced from it to become Proconsul of Asia, Proconsul of Africa, and Pretorian Prefect. Later, however, probably from the time that the *comites consistoriani* were given equal rank with the proconsuls,[5] any such appointments preceded the Mastership, as we have seen in the case of Cassiodorus.

Frequently Masters were promoted from the Ministry of Finance, as in the case of Hadrianus,[6] Macedonius,[7] and Palladius,[8] who had been Counts of the Sacred Largesses before being made Masters of the Offices. It is also true that the reverse order was sometimes followed, and that ex-Masters were made Counts of the Sacred Largesses,[9] but this was not at all usual and doubtless ceased as the mastership became increasingly important.

In the fourth and fifth centuries the Consulate usually followed the Mastership, if we may judge from the following instances: Eugenius, Master in 346, and then *consul ordinarius designatus;*[10] Rufinus, Master in 390, and Consul in 392;[11] Nomus, Master in 443–4, Consul in 445;[12] Opilio, Master in 449–50, Consul in 453;[13] and Vincomalus, Master and *consul designatus* in 452.[14] But even at this time the Consulship sometimes preceded the Mastership,[15] and in the following century it was, as a rule, held first, as for example, by Cassiodorus[16] and Hermogenes.[17]

[1] Ammianus, 28, 2, 5; 9: *Cod. Theod.* I, 15, 10 (379). [2] Zosimus, 5, 40; Sozomenos, 9, 8.

[3] *Rationalis adparitoris armorum magistri,* Ammianus, 15, 5, 36; 27, 6, 36; 27, 9, 2 (368). [4] Ammianus, 28, 4, 3 (before 369).

[5] *Codex Theodosianus,* VI, 12, 1 (399).

[6] *Codex Theodosianus,* V, 14, 35; VI, 26, 11.

[7] *Codex Theodosianus,* XI, 30, 39; Severus, *Sacra Historia,* 2, 48.

[8] *Codex Theodosianus,* IV, 13, 8, 9; X, 24, 3.

[9] So Felix under Julian, as recorded by Ammianus, 20, 9, 5; 23, 1, 5.

[10] Dessau, *Inscriptiones Selectae,* 1244; see above.

[11] *Codex Theodosianus,* X, 22, 3; I, 29, 7 and 8; cf. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt,* vol. 5, p. 268.

[12] *Codex Justinianus,* I, 31, 4; *Novellae Theodosii,* 24, 25.

[13] *Novellae Valentiniani,* 28, 30. [14] Mansi, vol. 7, p. 497; 505.

[15] An example is that of Valerius, *magister* and *ex consule ordinarius; Codex Theodosianus,* VII, 8, 16 (435). [16] See above, p. 106.

[17] Master and ex-Consul in 535, *Novellae Justiniani,* 2. However, if this is the same Hermogenes who was Master in 533 (*Codex Justinianus,* V, 17, 11), he may have been Consul and Master at the same time.

Digitized by Google

As the Quaestorship and the Mastership were offices of practically equal rank in the hierarchy of Roman officials, the holding of the one was not a preliminary step to holding the other. In the sixth century, indeed, these two offices were at times placed in the hands of one person, as we have seen in the cases of Trebonian[1] and Anastasius.[2] However, at the same epoch, in the Gothic Kingdom in Italy, Eugenes[3] and Cassiodorus[4] both held the Quaestorship before the Mastership of the Offices.

Once the Mastership had been put in possession of the greater part of the power that it eventually wielded, it tended to become the regular prelude to a Prefecture; promotions were made directly from the former to the latter office as early as the middle of the fourth century. So it was with Florentius,[5] Siburius,[6] Syagrius,[7] Hadrianus,[8] Anthemius,[9] and Cassiodorus,[10] Pretorian Prefects, and Theodotus[11] and Aemilianus,[12] Urban Prefects. With Eugenius[13] and Rufinus,[14] the Consulate intervened between Mastership and Prefecture.

As a rule, then, we may conclude that a Master of the Offices had had a considerable official experience previous to attaining this position, and might reasonably look forward to a still higher office. Nevertheless it is probable that in many cases no strict rules for promotion were observed, and influence and ability had much to do with obtaining the Mastership. So when Cassiodorus[3] boasted that he had obtained his position by merit and not through the influence of wealth, he implied that the opposite sometimes occurred. And we know that Petrus, a lawyer of Constantinople, without official position, was rewarded

[1] *Novellae Justiniani*, 23 (536). Trebonian's career is instructive. He was an *illustris* with the rank of a Master in active service in 528 (*Codex Justinianus, de novo codice*, 1); in 530 he was Quaestor (*id.*, I, 17, 1); in 533 he was Master and ex-Quaestor (*id.*, I, 17, 2 *pr.*); finally, in 536, he held both Mastership and Quaestorship (*Novellae Justiniani*, 23).

[2] Corippus, *Panegyr. Pr.*, 30 (565).

[3] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 1, 12 and 13.

[4] See p. 106.

[5] Ammianus, 20, 2, 2 (360).

[6] *Codex Theodosianus*, XI, 31, 7; cf. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, vol. VI, *auctores antiquissimi*, p. cxxxi.

[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 15, 10; XI, 30, 38 (380).

[8] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 27, 11; II, 8, 24 (400).

[9] *Codex Theodosianus*, XVI, 4, 4; VII, 10, 1 (405).

[10] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 9, 24, 25 (533).

[11] *Codex Theodosianus*, VII, 1, 14: VI, 28, 5 (395).

[12] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 9, 3; XV, 1, 44 (406).

[13] Dessau, *op. cit.*, 1244.

[14] *Codex Theodosianus*, I, 29, 7; VIII, 6, 2; see above.

[15] *Variae*, 9, 24.

Digitized by Google

by Justinian with this office, in recognition of his astuteness displayed on a diplomatic mission to Italy.[1]

The Mastership, like the Quaestorship, was, strictly speaking, an annual charge,[2] but apparently there was no limit placed upon the number of times that it could be held by the same person.[3]

[1] Procopius, *De bello Goth.*, 1, 3, 6–8; 2, 22: *Historia Arcana*, 16.

[2] Lécrevain, *Le Sénat Romain*, p. 67; cf. Appendix B.

[3] Hadrianus was Master from 397 to 399 (*Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 26, 11; 27, 11); Helio was Master from 414 (*Codex Theodosianus*, XIII, 3, 17) to 427 (*Cod. Theod.*, XIII, 3, 18), and, notably, Peter the Patrician was Master from 539 to 565 (Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, c. 16; *De Bello Gothico*, 4, 11; *Novellae Justiniani*, 123; 137). See Appendix B.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER V

THE TITLES, HONORS, AND PRIVILEGES OF THE MASTER OF THE OFFICES

I. The Roman Period

We have seen how, during the first three centuries following its establishment, the Mastership of the Offices gradually increased in influence and dignity, with the result that it successively entitled its holders to higher and more exclusive titles of rank, until they had passed through all the gradations of rank in the Later Empire, from the Perfectissimate to the Gloriosissimate. And we have found that, during the first two of these centuries, the Masters of the Offices received the distinction of the *comitiva*, which in the highest of its three grades had become attached to this, as well as to other imperial dignities. In a preceding chapter[1] we traced the different stages in the elevation of the Mastership through the various grades of rank, and it will be unnecessary to review the same facts again here; it will be sufficient, after a consideration of the privileges and honors that at various times fell to the lot of the Masters, to append lists of the known examples of the use of the several titles pertaining to these classes, which furnish the basis for the conclusions already presented. The same plan will be adopted in regard to the *comitiva*, the connection of which with the Mastership has been amply discussed.[2]

The incumbents of the magisterial dignity, *tot titulis claram, tot insignibus opulentam*,[3] enjoyed the right to use the title and insignia of the special order of rank to which their office at any time gave admission. Likewise they were in possession of the numerous privileges and exemptions to which the members of these orders were entitled.

The emblems of the Master of the Offices, *insignia viri illustris magistri officiorum*, which appear in the *Notitia Dignitatum*[4] and which may be called the Master's official seal, were

[1] Chapter III, pp. 44–47.
[2] Pp. 29, 31, 44.
[3] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 6, 6, 8.
[4] *Or.* XI, *occ.* IX.

Digitized by Google

inscribed on the codicils containing his appointment,[1] which was couched in the language of Cassiodorus's *formula magisteriae dignitatis*. These emblems consist of the following parts arranged within a square border. At the top, a draped table, upon which is depicted a *liber mandatorum*, adorned with the portrait (*imago*) of the Emperor or Emperors. Below is the word FABRICAE, underneath which are grouped seven[2] round shields; alongside of and beneath these were various types of offensive and defensive weapons and armor. The legend FABRICAE and the weapons have obvious reference to the Master's control of the arsenals, while the seven shields with their varied blazonry represent the seven *scholae* of the palace guards.

Along with the codicils there was given to the Master of the Offices an official guide or set of instructions (*mandata*) issued by the Emperor to guide him in the conduct of the business of his office. This constituted the *liber mandatorum* represented in the Master's insignia.[3]

For the issuance of his diploma of appointment and his *mandata*, in all probability the Master of the Offices, like other officials,[4] had to make a donation (*consuetudo*, *sportula*), at first voluntary, but later obligatory, and of a definite amount, to the clerks of the bureau whose duty it was to prepare such documents. In the case of the Master, the recipients of these gratuities were probably the *chartularii sacri cubiculi*, the *primicerius notariorum*, his *adiutor* and his *laterculenses*.[5] Further, upon the receipt of such an appointment it was the custom for the beneficiary to express his gratitude by suitable gifts to the Emperor and Empress.[6]

We have no information regarding any special robes of office

[1] Cf. Böcking, *Über die Notitia Dignitatum utriusque imperii*, p. 97. Justinian translated *insignia* by σύμβολα or παρασήματα τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις κωδικέλλοις.

[2] The *Notitia Dignitatum or.* has only six shields, but one is obviously lacking; cf. Böcking, *Notitia Dignitatum*, vol. 1, p. 234. Further differences between the oriental and occidental insignia are that the former has the *imago* of one Emperor only, while the latter has the *imagines* of two, and that the weapons depicted in each are not of the same types, nor arranged in the same way.

[3] Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, p. 869; cf. *Novellae Justiniani*, 17 *pr.*; 24, 6 (referring to the appointment of provincial *iudices*): *non solum eis praebere magistratus insignia in his qui vocantur codicilli, sed etiam inscribere modum secundum quem regant administrationem, quae ante nos legislatores mandata principis appellabant.*

[4] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 27, 1, 19; 2, 36; *Novellae Justiniani*, 8, *notitia*; 24 *fin.*

[5] Böcking, *Über die Notitia Dignitatum*, p. 97; Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 1, p. 869.

[6] Karlowa, *op. cit.*, p. 870; Böcking, *op. cit.*

Digitized by Google

which the Master wore during this period. Still we know that upon the occasion of the procession of the Emperor Heraclius to the church of St. Sophia on January 1, 639 A.D., a function described in the *De Caerimoniis*,[1] the Master Eustathius and four patricians wore the *toga*, which, from being the characteristic dress of Roman citizens, had evidently become the robe of state of certain high officials and dignitaries of the Eastern court. In any case an essential part of the Master's official regalia was the *cingulum*.

The conferment of the *cingulum*, or belt of office, was of greater significance in promotions to the Mastership, as to other official posts, than the granting of the codicils. The *cingulum* had originally been the symbol of military service, but under the Later Empire it denoted employment in the civil administration as well. The conferment of this *cingulum* was so essential a feature in the investiture of such officials, and its use was so characteristic of the tenure of office, that eventually *cingulum* came to be employed in official language as synonymous with *magistratus* or ἀρχή.[2]

From 441 A.D.,[3] and probably from the time the Master's office admitted its occupant to the class of the *illustres*, it was the custom to elevate a deserving official to the Illustrissimate by the conferment of an honorary Mastership, which did not involve the performance of the duties appertaining to that position. This honorary Mastership, again, might be conferred in two grades, distinguished by the possession of the right to wear the *cingulum*, or the lack of it.

In consequence, all the *illustres* who had the title of Master of the Offices were not of the same rank. The highest was the Master *pro tempore* in office. He was classed with the *illustres in actu positi*, or *administratores*, officials like himself in active service. Next in order came those who had gone into retirement after having held the Mastership. Such were called *illustres honorati*.

Then came those who had been awarded both the *cingulum* and the codicils of the Mastership without being called upon to undertake its burdens. Such appointments were really retirements, with the rank of the office that the recipient might have next

[1] *De Caer.*, 2, 28.

[2] *Novellae Justiniani*, 24, 2; etc.

[3] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 8, 2.

Digitized by Google

attained if he had remained in active service. The Mastership was thus awarded to *primicerii* of the *tribuni notarii*,[1] but with the special provision that they should rank as if they had actually held the Mastership; that is, as *honorati*. Usually, however, Masters of this type belonged to the *illustres vacantes*, who might, if called upon subsequently to undertake the active administration of the Mastership, be classed among the *administratores*.

Finally, there were Masters who received the codicils without the *cingulum*. These too were on the retired list, and belonged to the class of *illustres honorarii*. In each of the last two classes a distinction was made between those who had received the insignia, or diploma, of their rank at the hand of the Emperor, and those to whom these emblems had been merely despatched. The former in each case were ranked above the latter. Within each of these classes of *illustres* the Masters ranked according to the position which, as we have seen, the Masters *in actu positi* took among the high officials of the Empire. Those who were in active service took precedence over all *honorati*, and these in turn over all *vacantes* and *honorarii*. However, *illustres vacantes* with the title of Master did not take rank above all *honorarii*, but only above such as had attained the same or a lower dignity. Among Masters of the same class the seniority was decided according to the time of their respective appointments.[2]

The Masters of the Offices as *clarissimi*, *spectabiles*, or *illustres* were members of the senatorial order,[3] and enjoyed all the special privileges and exemptions which were accorded to senators as a body, as well as to the members of these classes of rank. The most important of such advantages fell to the lot of the Masters in connection with the Illustrissimate. These included freedom from certain obligations to the fiscus; exemption from the necessity of furnishing recruits and horses to the army, of performing curial *munera* in provincial towns, and of furnishing the regular *hospitium* to officers and soldiers; and also the right

[1] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 7, 2, 5 (Zeno): *Hoc etiam adiciendo, ut primicerius post depositam publicam numerorum sollicitudinem, ac si ipsam gessisset administrationem, cuius consequitur dignitatem, magistri officiorum pro antiqua consuetudine infulas sortiatur, omnibus vacantibus quamvis tempore praecedentibus praeponendus.*

[2] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 8, 2. Cf. Jullian in Daremberg et Saglio, vol. 3, pp. 386 f.; Karlowa, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 870 f.

[3] Lécrevain in Daremberg et Saglio, vol. 4, p. 1197, s. v. *senatus*.

Digitized by Google

to pass on their titles and privileges to their wives and children, as well as an exceptional position before the law both in the matter of the courts before which they could be summoned and in the penalties to which they were subject. Furthermore, when the *clarissimi* and the *spectabiles* were relieved of the necessity of residing at the capital, active membership in the senate was practically confined to the *illustres*.[1] In regard to the obligation of furnishing quarters to troops, we are told specifically that the Masters of the Offices, and the Quaestors, were allowed to have one residence and the half of another immune from this burden during their lifetime, and that their heirs could claim exemption for one house.[2]

In addition to the title of his office and that of his order of rank, the Master of the Offices received many other honorable and complimentary appellations. Conspicuous among these was the term *frater amantissime*, used as a form of address to their Masters by the Western Emperors about the middle of the fifth century.[3] Along with other notables in the fifth and early sixth centuries, the Master of the Offices was sometimes accorded the titles of *excellentissimus*,[4] *vir excelsus*,[5] and *sublimissimus*,[6] which did not denote any definite rank but were attributed to high officials in general. Again, titles suitable to the Master himself were used with reference to his office, as in the phrase *illustris summitas magistri*,[7] or to the place where his authority was exercised, as in the application of *sublimis* to his *iudicium*.[8]

Furthermore, in official communications from the Emperor, the Masters were entitled to a series of substantive forms of address, which were very much the same as those used towards other officials of the rank of *illustres*.[9] These forms are arranged below in alphabetical order.

[1] Jullian in Daremberg et Saglio, vol. 3, pp. 387 f., s. v. *illustres*.

[2] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 40, 10 (Valentinian and Marcian): *Magistri vero officiorum vel quaestores unam semis domum suam quoad vixerint habeant hospitium onere libertam: heredes vero eorum praedicti unam ab hospitibus iure defendant.*

[3] *Flegeti f(rater) a(mantissime)*, *Novellae Theodosii*, 21 (441); Nomus, id. 24 (443), 25 (444); Opilio, *Novellae Valentiniani*, 28 (449), 30 (450).

[4] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 16, 4 (Zeno); I, 31, 5 (527).

[5] *Codex Justinianus*, I, 17, 2 (533).

[6] *Codex Justinianus*, VII, 62, 38 (529).

[7] *Codex Theodosianus*, VI, 10, 4 (425).

[8] *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 59, 9.

[9] Cf. Karlowa, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. I, p. 871; Koch, *Byzantinische Beamtentitel*, p. 124; *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXVI, pp. 139 f.

Digitized by Google

1. **Amplitudo**, "Your Greatness"

Amplitudo tua appears twice in constitutions of the fifth century.

Novellae Valentiniani, 30 (year 450).
Codex Justinianus, XII, 25, 4 (474).

2. **Auctoritas**, "Your Worthiness"

Illustris auctoritas tua is used with considerable frequency, especially in the West, towards the end of the first half of the fifth century. The Greek form, ἡ ὑπερλαμπροτάτη καὶ μεγαλοφύης αὐθεντία σή (*illustrissima et magnifica auctoritas tua*) appears in the *acta* of the Council of Chalcedon.[1]

Codex Theodosianus, VI, 27, 23 (year 430).
Novellae Theodosii, 24 (443); 25 (444).
Novellae Valentiniani, 28 (449); 30 (450).

3. **Celsitudo**, "Your Highness"

Tua celsitudo (ἡ σὴ ὑπεροχή) is employed from about the middle of the fifth century until well into the sixth.

Novellae Theodosii, 21 (year 441).
Codex Justinianus, XII, 19, 12 (Leo); XII, 20, 3 (id.); XII, 29, 2 (474).
Novellae Justiniani, 85 (539).

4. **Culmen**, "Your Eminence"

Culmen tuum (ἡ σὴ ὑπεροχή) is in use during the same period as *tua celsitudo*.

Novellae Theodosii, 21 (year 441), cf. *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 3; 24 (443), cf. *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 4.
Codex Justinianus, XII, 29, 3 (Zeno); XII, 19, 12 (Anastasius); I, 31, 5 (527).

5. **Eminentia**, "Your Eminency"

Eminentia tua appears in the early sixth century.

Codex Justinianus, XII, 19, 12 (Anastasius).
Novellae Justiniani, 10 ep. (535).

6. **Gloria**, "Your Glory"

The Greek equivalent of *tua gloria*, ἡ σὴ ἐνδοξότης, is found in a constitution of 565.

Novellae Justiniani, 137 ep.

7. **Magnificentia**, "Your Magnificence"

Magnificentia tua is used at the opening of the fifth century.

Codex Theodosianus, I, 9, 3 (year 405); VI, 27, 17 (415).

8. **Magnitudo**, "Your Grandeur"

Magnitudo tua occurs throughout the fifth and early in the sixth centuries.

Novellae Theodosii, 25 (year 444).
Codex Justinianus, XII, 25, 4 (474); XII, 29, 3 (Zeno); XII, 19, 12 (Anastasius); XII, 19, 15 (527).

[1] Mansi, vol. 7, p. 500; p. 505 (year 451).

Digitized by Google

9. **Sinceritas**, "Your Honor"

One example of *sinceritas tua* comes from the fourth century.

Codex Theodosianus, VIII, 5, 22 (year 365).

10. **Sublimitas**, "Your Loftiness"

Sublimitas tua is the most common of these designations in constitutions addressed to the Master of the Offices, being used throughout the whole of the fifth and the early part of the sixth centuries. In Greek, like *celsitudo* and *culmen*, it is rendered by ὑπεροχή, which also translates *eminentia* and seems to have no preferred Latin equivalent.[1]

Codex Theodosianus, VI, 27, 18 (year 416).
Novellae Theodosiani, 21 (441); cf. *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 3.
Novellae Valentiniani, 28 (449).
Codex Justinianus, XI, 10, 6 (Leo and Anthemius); XI, 10, 7 (id.); XII, 5, 3 (id.); XII, 20, 3 (Leo); XII, 25, 4 (474); I, 31, 5 (527); XII, 19, 15 (527).
Novellae Justiniani, 2 ep. (535); 14 ep. (id.)

It remains to present in chronological order the examples of the use of the titles of the several orders of rank to which the Mastership of the Offices at various times admitted its holders. These titles were *comes*, *vir clarissimus*, *vir spectabilis*, *vir magnificus* or *magnificentissimus*, and *vir gloriosus* or *gloriosissimus*.

1. **Comes**, "Count"

Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, no. 1244, *magister officiorum omnium comes domesticus ordinis primi* (year 346).
Codex Theodosianus, VIII, 5, 8 (357); I, 9, 1 (359); IX, 38, 11 (410); VI, 29, 10 (412); VI, 33, 1, cf. *Codex Justinianus*, XII, 26, 1 (416); I, 8, 3, cf. *Codex Justinianus*, I, 30, 2 (424); VII, 8, 15 (430).
Novellae Theodosii, 21, cf. *Codex Justinianus*, I, 31, 3; XII, 29, 1 (441).
Codex Justinianus, I, 24, 4 (444).
Mansi, vol. 6, p. 821 (449).
Codex Justinianus, XII, 5, 3; XII, 25, 3 (Leo and Anthemius); XII, 19, 10 (Leo); XII, 25, 4 (474).

2. **Vir Clarissimus**, "The Honorable"

Codex Theodosianus, VIII, 5, 8 (year 357); I, 9, 1 (359).

3. **Vir Spectabilis**, "The Respectable"

Codex Theodosianus, VIII, 5, 35 (year 378).

4. **Vir Illustris**, "The Illustrious"

Symmachus, *Relationes*, 34, 8 *v. c. et inlustris;* 38, 4; 43, 2 (year 384–5).
Marcellus, *De medicamentis*, *tit.* (*post* 395).
Codex Justinianus, I, 55, 8 (409).
Codex Theodosianus, VI, 29, 10 (412); VI, 26, 17 (416); VI, 27, 20 (427).

[1] Koch, *Byzantinische Beamtentitel*, p. 124.

Digitized by Google

Novellae Theodosii, 6, *illustris et magnificus* (438).
Codex Justinianus, VII, 63, 4 (440); XII, 21, 5 (440–1); XII, 26, 2 (443–4?); I, 51, 11 (444).
Marini, *Papiri*, 82, *illustris et magnificus* (489).
Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, VIII, 989 (V–VI cent.).
Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 1, 12 (507–11); 1, 13 (507–11).
Codex Justinianus, XII, 50, 3 (Justinian); XII, 50, 9 (id.).
Novellae Justiniani, 23 (536).
Mansi, vol. 8, p. 1118 (536).

5. **Vir Magnificus** or **Magnificentissmus** (μεγαλοπρεπέστατος), "The Magnificent"
Mansi, vol. 6, p. 821 (year 449); vol. 6, p. 564; p. 940; p. 993; vol. 7, p. 97, pp. 185 ff., *magnificentissimus et gloriosissimus*, Greek μεγαλοπρεπέστατος καὶ ἐνδοξότατος (451).
Codex Justinianus, XII, 20, 4 (Leo); III, 24, 3, 2 (485–6); I, *de novo codice* (528).

The use of *gloriosissimus* in conjunction with *magnificentissimus* in 451 antedates the creation of the special class of the *gloriosissimi*, and occurs only in the *acta* of the Council of Chalcedon.

6. **Vir Gloriosus** or **Gloriosissimus** (ἐνδοξότατος), "The Glorious"
Mansi, vol. 6, pp. 564, 940, 993; vol. 7, pp. 97, 185 ff. (year 451); on the use of *gloriosissimus* at this date, see above.
Novellae Justiniani, 2 pr. (535), 10 pr. (id.).
Mansi, vol. 8, p. 817 (531).
Mansi, vol. 8, p. 1118, p. 1119 (536).
Novellae Justiniani, 79, ep. (539); 82, 1 (id.), 85 pr. (id.); 123 pr. (546).
Historiens des Gaules et de le France (*Boquet*), vol. IV, p. 85 (588).
Chronicon Paschale, year 626.
Mansi, vol. 11, p. 209, p. 217, pp. 221 ff. (680).

II. The Byzantine Period

Besides the administrative changes that mark the transition from the Roman to the Byzantine Period, there are also changes in the character and organization of the court ceremonial which reflect the current interpretation of the constitutional position of the Emperor. Justinian succeeded in reëstablishing the cult of the deified Emperor, a revival of the old emperor worship disguised under a Christian name; he instituted, and the Byzantine Emperors further elaborated, the ceremonial which accorded with such an assertion of absolutism. In this theory of state, justly called "Caesaropapism," of which the motto was "a single God, a single Empire," the Emperor was the vicar of God upon Earth, the equal of the Apostles and the head of the Church, who governed for Christ and with Christ.[1]

[1] Hesseling, *Essai sur la civilization byzantine*, 1907, pp. 174 ff.

Digitized by Google

As a natural consequence, the Emperor became the centre, not only of the political, but also of the religious, life at the capital. Herein we find the explanation of the peculiar character of the court ceremonies of this epoch, described for us in so great detail in the *De Caeremoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. It was a truly "pontifical" life that the rulers of Constantinople led in the midst of chants, processions, parades, and rhythmic acclamations, which, in the palace "guarded of God," constituted the order of ceremonies that regulated each of their acts and the countless changes of their gorgeous costume.[1]

In the performance of these ritual obligations the Emperor was accompanied by the dignitaries and officials resident in the capital, marshalled in a fixed order according to their titles of rank. Their raiment, position, and actions upon each public occasion were as rigorously prescribed as those of the Sovereign himself. Under such conditions it will be readily seen that during the Byzantine Period the honors and privileges of the Mastership were chiefly connected with the part which those of this grade of dignity played in the ceremonial life of the palace.

In the course of the ninth century the Mastership became one of the dignities bestowed for life by the conferment of certain insignia (*αἱ διὰ βραβείων ἀξίαι*).[2] On account of the high rank of the Mastership among the dignities of the Empire, holders of this title naturally belonged to the senatorial order (*οἱ συγκλητικοί*) in its wide sense, in contrast with the senate as a small body of officials actively assisting in the counsels of state.[3] They also belonged to the smaller group of senatorial dignitaries known as *οἱ προελευσιμαῖοι*,[4] those entitled to appear in the imperial *cortège* on the occasion of public processions.[5] And with these latter, they, in company with certain other court officials, formed the group of dignitaries known as the *ἄρχοντες τοῦ Λαυσιακοῦ*.[6] The Masters also belonged to the *οἱ ὑπὸ καμπάγιον*, the wearers of the

[1] Diehl, *Études byzantines*, pp. 108 ff.

[2] Philotheos, 707: *οἵτινες ἅπαξ διδόμεναι οὐδαμῶς ἀναστρέφονται.*

[3] *De Caer.*, 1, 1: *οἱ δὲ μάγιστροι καὶ ἀνθύπατοι καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ συγκλητικοί*; 20; 24; 2, 6: *μετὰ τε τῶν μαγίστρων καὶ πατρικίων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τῆς συγκλήτου*: Bury, *Imperial Administration*, 37 ff.

[4] Philotheos, 707.

[5] Bury, *Imperial Administration*, p. 23.

[6] Philotheos, 787: *καὶ γίνεται ἡ διανομὴ εἰς μόνους τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοῦ Λαυσιακοῦ, οἷον εἰς μαγίστρους, πραιποσίτους, ἀνθυπάτους*, etc. The Lausiakon was one of the edifices of the palace, Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

Digitized by Google

kampagion, which included practically all the high dignitaries and many of the officers of the court, that is, all entitled to wear this particular style of shoe as part of their official uniform.[1] Classes like these, as may be readily seen from their designations, existed for ceremonial purposes only.

We have seen how the rank gradations of the *illustres*, *gloriosissimi*, and the like, of the later Roman period disappeared before the new honorary orders of the Byzantine epoch. Hence we no longer find in use the older adjectival titles of rank, which the Masters had previously enjoyed. The changed position of the Mastership itself, which from an office had become one of the honorary orders, would have prevented their employment even if they had not fallen into disuse. However, as late as the reign of Leo VI, the Masters were called ἐνδοξότατοι (*gloriosissimi*),[2] without any special degree of rank being thereby indicated, and at the same time Stylianos was addressed as ὁ περιφανέστατος, or ὁ ὑπερφυέστατος μάγιστρος,[3] phrases in which the adjectives are purely personal compliments.

The *De Caeremoniis* has preserved accounts of two types of ceremonies for the conferment of the dignity (ἀξία, τιμή) of the Mastership. The earlier of these dates from the time when there was only one Master, and is, therefore, prior to the middle of the eighth century.[4] Here we have the procedure followed in case the Emperor ordered that a Master be appointed on the occasion of a procession to St. Sophia. At the palace, in the presence of the Patricians and the whole senate, the Praepositus conducted before the Emperor the Patrician chosen for elevation to the Mastership. Upon him the ruler conferred an embroidered robe (στιχάριον) and a belt (βαλτίδιον). He was then led away, to be reintroduced shortly afterwards, clad in his new insignia, and then placed "at the head of the *sekreton*, above all the Patricians."

The latter type of ceremony,[5] of a time when the Mastership had become an order of rank, was probably that in use in the

[1] Philotheos, 757: φίλους τοὺς ὑπὸ καμπάγιν ἅπαντας, ἄρχοντας τῆς συγκλήτου, ἀπό τε μαγίστρων, etc.; 759, τοὺς ὑπὸ καμπάγιν πάντας, οἷον μαγίστρους, etc.; cf. 769, 1. Cf. Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 38 f. On the *kampagion*, see *De Caer.*, 2, 40, 639.

[2] Philotheos, 710: ἡ τῶν ἐνδοξοτάτων μαγίστρων ἀξία. The Patricians were called περίβλεπτοι (*spectabiles*), id.

[3] *Novellae, Leonis VI*, 1, 18, etc.; cf. Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[4] *De Caer.*, 1, 46, 231–33.

[5] *De Caer.*, 1, 46, 234–5; 1, 26.

Digitized by Google

tenth century. An appointment in this fashion might be made on any ordinary Sunday (*κυριακὴ παγανή*), and then it took place in the *consistorium*.[1] There, in the presence of the whole body of senators, arranged according to their orders of rank, the Praepositus presented the Patrician selected for promotion, and the Emperor conferred upon him the robe and belt of his new rank. As in the older ceremony, the newly appointed Master was then led away by the Praepositus, soon to reappear wearing his new decorations, and to take his place at the head of the *sekreton* of the Patricians. At the conclusion of the ceremony the Master went to the apartment of the palace called the Indoi, put on a purple cloak (*σαγίον ἀληθινόν*) over his robe and departed for his own house, as far as which, if it happened to be in the neighborhood of the palace, he was escorted by the various grades of dignitaries, the Foot Guards of the Domestici and the Scholarians, the soldiers of the Watch, the *διαιτάριοι*, and the Decani. If he lived at a distance the dignitaries were excused from this exhibition of respect, which, however, the others were still obliged to manifest.

A similar promotion to the Mastership might also occur on the occasion of a festival, as, for example, Candlemas.[2] Here the procedure was practically the same as that just described, except that the Master of Ceremonies, *ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως*, played the rôle of the Praepositus in introducing the candidate for promotion. The escort to the Master's house was also the same as in the preceding ceremony. These promotions might take place elsewhere than in the *consistorium*, for, in connection with the account of the reception of a foreign envoy,[3] mention is made of a *triclinium* (*τρίκλινος*) in which appointments to the Mastership were made.[4]

In all of these ceremonies the essential feature was the conferment of the insignia of the Mastership — the robe and the belt. These insignia were called *βραβεῖα*, and hence the Mastership was classed among the *αἱ διὰ βραβείων ἀξίαι*. Philotheos[5] gives the insigne (*βραβεῖον*) of this rank as follows: a white tunic

[1] *De Caer.*, 1, 46. [2] *De Caer.*, 1, 26. [3] *De Caer.*, 2, 15, 573; 578.

[4] *De Caer.*, *loc. cit.*: *ὁ τρίκλινος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ καμελαύκιον ἵσταται καὶ οἱ μάγιστροι γίγνονται.*

[5] Philotheos, 710–11: *χίτων λευκὸς ὢν χρυσοῦφαντος, καὶ ἐπωμὶς χρυσόταβλος, καὶ ζώνη δερματίνη κόκκινος ἐκ λίθων τιμίων κεκοσμημένη, ἥτις λέγεται βαλτίδιν, ἐπὶ τοῦ κονσιστορίου ἐκ βασιλικῆς χειρὸς ἐπιδίδοται.*

Digitized by Google

embroidered with gold, a cloak with a golden border, and a scarlet leather belt studded with precious stones: all conferred by the Emperor's hand in the consistory. The whole ceremony is evidently a development from that of the conferment of the cingulum in the preceding period. However, as the Mastership is no longer an office, the codicils and the *liber mandatorum* do not now accompany the outward badge of rank.

In addition to this, their regular uniform on official occasions, at certain specified ceremonies the Masters were required to wear special attire. Thus we find regulations laid down for their dress at the audiences held at the daily opening of the palace on Sundays and on week-days, and for the occasion of their return to court after an absence on public or private business.[1] Probably at the functions where they appeared with the so-called loroi (λῶροι) the Masters presented their most gorgeous appearance. These lōroi were golden scarfs, twelve in number, worn by the Masters, or, if there were fewer than twelve Masters, by them and by a number of Proconsuls or other dignitaries and officials sufficient to bring the total up to twelve, on particularly solemn occasions. Such occasions were the procession to St. Sophia,[2] Christmas,[3] and Easter.[4] However, the loroi might also be worn on extraordinary occasions, as at the reception of the envoys of Amerimnes, who had come from Tarsus in 917 to negotiate for the exchange of captives and the conclusion of peace.[5]

The explanation of this custom of the wearing of the loroi is given in the *De Caeremoniis* in connection with the description of the Easter ceremonial,[6] and also alluded to in Philotheos.[7] The loroi worn by the Masters and the Patricians symbolized the entombment of Christ; their golden decoration suggested the glory of his resurrection. Thus arrayed, the Masters and the

[1] *De Caer.*, 2, 1.

[2] *De Caer.*, 1, 1, 24: καὶ εἰσέρχεται ὁ πραιπόσιτος, προπορευόμενος τῇ τάξει τῶν μαγίστρων καὶ ἀνθυπάτων, ἤγουν τῶν φορούντων τοὺς δώδεκα χρυσοῦφάντους λώρους.

[3] Philotheos, 742: μαγίστρους δύο, ἀνθυπάτους πατρικίους στρατηγοὺς ἕξ, βουλγάρους φίλους δύο, ὀφφικιαλίους ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ λογοθέτου τάξεως καὶ κατωτέρου δύο, πρὸς τὸ συνανακληθῆναι τῷ βασιλεῖ εἰς τύπον τῆς ἀποστολικῆς δωδεκάδος.

[4] *De Caer.*, 2, 40, 637 ff.: τὸ μὲν περιβεβλῆσθαι λώρους τοὺς μαγίστρους καὶ πατρικίους ἐν τῇ εὐφρασίμῳ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἀναστάσεως Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν; Philotheos, 766: τοὺς μὲν μαγίστρους, ἀνθυπάτους καὶ πατρικίους, τοὺς λώρους ἡμφιεσμένους μετὰ τῶν χρυσέων αὐτῶν θωρακίων καὶ μόνον. Loroi, probably differing in some respects from those now under consideration, were sometimes carried by other dignitaries and officials; cf. *De Caer.*, 1, 50; 2, 28.

[5] *De Caer.*, 2, 15, 574.

[6] *De Caer.*, 2, 40.

[7] Philotheos, 742, see above.

Digitized by Google

Patricians represented the twelve Apostles; the Emperor, as far as was humanly possible, represented the Lord. Upon these occasions, in addition to the loroi, the Masters and Patricians carried staffs (*σκεπαῖα*) in the form of a cross, to symbolize the triumph of Christ over death, and also what were popularly called *τόμοι ἀνεξικακίας*, parchments inscribed with the Christian doctrines, which they, in the character of disciples, bore before the Emperor. Further, the wrapping of their legs in linen and their wearing of golden sandals was emblematic of the death and glorification of Christ. All these insignia were believed to have had their origin in those of the victorious Roman proconsul when rendering an account of his achievements to the consuls upon his return to the city.[1]

The loroi, and the other vestments that the Masters wore with them, apparently did not belong to these dignitaries, like the insignia of their order, but were supplied to them for the particular ceremonies. These articles were kept in store in the Church of the Lord,[2] where, in the time of Constantine VII, there were stored fifteen loroi woven with gold, an equal number of short-sleeved tunics of the same material to match, and twelve breastpieces (*θωράκια*) to go with the loroi.[3] Besides these there were twenty-five colored cloaks with tassels and a golden border,[4] to be worn by Masters, Proconsuls, and Patricians.

Upon their inauguration into their new order of rank it was customary for the Masters to distribute various gratuities (*συνήθειαι*).[5] The Master of Ceremonies, *ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως*, received the *καμίσιον*, a sort of cloak, from the new Master of the Offices, who also had to entertain the Praepositi and the other Masters; to all of them he made gifts in the form of articles of apparel. Furthermore, he was obliged to make a monetary donative to these dignitaries and to various court officers, the total of which was double that distributed by a Patrician on

[1] *De Caer.*, 2, 40, 638–9. [2] *ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Κυρίου*, *De Caer.*, 2, 40; *fin.*, 41.

[3] *De Caer.*, 2, 41: *Λῶροι χρυσοῦφαντοι ιέ. κοντομανίκια χρυσοῦφαντα τῶν αὐτῶν λώρων ιβ'. Θωράκια τῶν αὐτῶν λώρων ιβ'.* One is tempted to see in the gold pectorals, published and described by Mr. Walter Dennison in vol. XII of this Series of Studies (pp. 109–117, 121–127 with plates I, VI, VII, XII, XIII) an example of these *θωράκια*. However, on the basis of the evidence at hand, this identification cannot be maintained.

[4] *χλανίδια φουνδάτα χροαμὰ χρυσόταβλα.*

[5] Philotheos, 711: *δίδωσι συνήθειαν τῷ τῆς καταστάσεως τὸ καμισιν αὐτοῦ, τοῖς δὲ πραιποσίτοις καὶ μαγίστροις συνεστιᾶται παρέχων αὐτοῖς καὶ δόματα ἱματίων. συνήθειαν δὲ τοῖς πραιποσίτοις καὶ μαγίστροις καὶ λοιποῖς τὴν τοῦ πατρικίου διπλὴν συνήθειαν παρέχει.*

Digitized by Google

similar occasions.[1] The ἀτρικλίναι, or officers in charge of the *kletorologion*, the court invitation list, were entitled to receive a gratuity of twenty-four milaresia from the newly decorated Master.[2] These obligatory presents, distributed among the Praepositi, the Master of Ceremonies and the other officials who functioned at the ceremony of the Master's inauguration, in addition to the older members of the same order, are a development of the *consuetudines* which, as we have seen, magistrates and dignitaries of the Later Roman period regularly donated to the various officials through whose hands the documents relative to their appointments passed. However, we have no mention of gifts presented at this time to the Emperor and Empress as a token of gratitude for the honor conferred.

On the other hand the Masters themselves were entitled to a number of largesses and perquisites, such as we have noted already upon the appointment of a new Master. At the annual celebration of the festival of the Brumalia in the month of November a generous purse (ἀποκόμβιον), part of which fell to the share of the Masters, was distributed by the rulers among their dignitaries and officials. In the time of Leo VI,[3] and earlier, the donations were as follows: on the day of the Senior Augustus, twenty pounds of gold; on the day of the Junior Augustus, ten pounds; and on the day of the Augusta, another eight pounds.

Later, under Constantine VII, a single largess of fifty pounds was made on the day of the Senior Augustus in the name of his partner on the throne, and of the Empress.[4] The largest shares of these donations were received by the Masters individually, and by the few dignitaries and officers who were classed with them for this occasion:[5] their portions were twice as large as those allotted to the Proconsuls.[6] In addition, at the same festival, each of the Masters who were guests at the imperial table received from the Emperor's hands a second largess of one hundred and sixty milaresia, and some silk goods of a special make.[7]

Similarly, on the anniversaries of the coronation of the Augusti (στέψιμον), and of their advancement to Autocratores or

[1] Cf. Philotheos, 710.

[2] Philotheos, 787: περὶ συνηθείας τῶν ἀρτικλινῶν. προβαλλομένης γὰρ ζώστης ἢ μαγίστρου, δίδοται αὐτοῖς ἐξ ἑκάστου αὐτῶν καθάπαξ, κδ'.

[3] Philotheos, 782; *De Caer.*, 2, 18, 606.

[4] *De Caer.*, 2, 18, 607.

[5] Philotheos, 784.

[6] Philotheos, 785.

[7] *De Caer.*, 2, 18, 607.

Digitized by Google

Senior Augusti (*αὐτοκρατορία*),[1] largesses were distributed. On these occasions the beneficiaries were the so-called *ἄρχοντες τοῦ Λαυσιακοῦ*, to whom, as has been pointed out previously, the Masters belonged.[2] Further, whenever the Masters accompanied the Emperor on his journeys from the capital, they, along with the others of his retinue, were entitled to a definite allowance of wine, supplied by the imperial Apothecarius.[3] Then, too, they and the Patricians together with the Praepositi and other officials, ate at the imperial table.[4]

Whenever it was the custom for the Emperor to entertain at banquets the prominent officials and dignitaries present at the capital, the order according to which these should be invited and seated was determined by a guest list, or Kletorologion.[5] Such a guest list is that compiled in 899 A.D. by Philotheos, the imperial *atriklines*, whose duty it was to supervise "the ceremony of imperial banquets in the palace, to receive guests and arrange them in order of precedence."[6] From this Kletorologion we see that at such banquets the Masters were accorded a place corresponding with the dignity of their position among the orders of rank of the Empire.

As a rule, the Masters were not included among those who were actually seated at the same table with the Emperor,[7] but headed the list of the other guests who sat at the general table.[8] However, on the second day of the celebration of the Brumalia, in the time of Leo VI, Masters who were relatives of the Emperor sat at the table of the Senior Augustus, while the rest were assigned to that of his colleague.[9] Under Constantine VII the Masters, with other dignitaries and officers, were placed with the Emperors at a table prepared for about sixteen persons.[10]

The various festivals, the celebration of which involved the entertainment of the Masters and other official guests at the palace, are enumerated in the Kletorologion.[11] The most important of these were Christmas, Candlemas, Easter, and the Brumalia.

It was a privilege as well as an obligation for all the Masters, like those enjoying other similar titles of honor, when in Constan-

[1] Cf. Reiske, *Ad De Cer.*, 2, 33.
[2] Philotheos, 787.
[3] περὶ τάξεων, 364, 484–5.
[4] περὶ τάξεων, 472.
[5] *De Cer.*, 2, 18, 603.
[6] Bury, *Imperial Administration*, p. 11.
[7] Philotheos, 727–8.
[8] Philotheos, 730.
[9] *De Cer.*, 2, 18, 604.
[10] *De Cer.*, 2, 18, 603.
[11] Philotheos, 741–754; 782: cf. *De Cer.*, 2, 18, 602 ff.

Digitized by Google

tinople to appear in the insignia of their rank at all the public ceremonies in which the Emperor and his retinue participated. These ceremonies included coronations and anniversaries of the Emperors, promotions of ministers, officers, and dignitaries, and festivals and processions in commemoration of various events of religious or political importance. The list of these functions, with the order of ceremonial at each, is given in the *De Caeremoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Here it will be sufficient to refer briefly to the part taken by the Masters on such occasions.

When the dignitaries of the court were arranged in order of precedence, the Masters regularly formed the first rank or *velum* (Βῆλον α'),[1] as they were the holders of the highest title of honor enjoyed by several persons at the same time. Sometimes, however, it might happen that the bearer of one of the higher titles participated in the procession of dignitaries. In that case he formed the first *velum*, as did the Curopalates at the elevation of a Nobilissimus, while the Masters made up the second.[2] Again, it was at times convenient to arrange the cortège in larger groups, and for this purpose the Masters were united with those of inferior rank in one *velum*.[3]

An inevitable result of the establishment of the several grades of dignity, such as the Mastership, the Proconsulship, and the like, was that the distinctions in rank thus created should not be confined to men alone but should be extended also to the wives of those who attained the respective titles. Accordingly we find the wives of officials and dignitaries ranked in various groups corresponding to the grades that their husbands had attained, and receiving titles derived from those conferred upon the men. In this way arose the titles of μαγίστρισσαι, πατρίκιαι, and other derivatives of the same character. The bearers of these titles were in a different position from the πατρίκιαι ζωσταί, who had this dignity conferred upon them directly, whereas the former depended for their position upon the rank of their husbands.

When the Empress participated in any of the public functions and was attended by the ladies of the court, these latter were arranged in ranks corresponding with those of the Emperor's cortège. The first *velum* was made up of the πατρίκιαι ζωσταί, while

[1] *De Caer.*, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, etc.
[2] *De Caer.*, 1, 44: βῆλον α', κουροπαλάτην; βῆλον β', μαγίστρους.
[3] *De Caer.*, 1, 9, 66.

Digitized by Google

the Magistrissai formed the second.[1] The celebration of the Feast of Pentecost,[2] that on the occasion of the birth of a son to the Emperor,[3] and certain irregular occurrences, such as the reception of Elga, Princess of Russia,[4] were functions at which the ladies of the court formally participated, forming a *sekreton*, graded like that of the officials and dignitaries.

As was to be expected, the ladies who owed the rank which they held to the position of their husbands, lost their honorary title upon the death of the latter, although they still continued to have an honorable recognition at court; upon official occasions they were placed after all those whose husbands were of senatorial rank.[5]

[1] *De Caer.*, 1, 9, 67, βῆλον α, πατρικίας ζωστάς: βῆλον β', μαγιστρίσας.
[2] *De Caer.*, 1, 9. [3] *De Caer.*, 2, 21, 216. [4] *De Caer.*, 2, 15, 596.
[5] *De Caer.*, 2, 21.

Digitized by Google

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For the convenience of the reader the editions of ancient authors cited, and of the modern works most frequently referred to, are here noted.

I. Greek and Latin Texts

Agathias, *Historiae. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.* Recensuit B. G. Niebuhr. Bonn, 1828.

Athanasius, *Apologia ad imperatorem Constantinum. Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 25. Edidit J. P. Migne. Paris, 1857.

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum Gestarum libri qui supersunt.* Edidit V. Gardthausen. Leipzig, 1874. Edidit C. V. Clark, vol. 1, Berlin, 1910.

Cassiodorus Senator, *Variae. Monumenta Germaniae Historiae, Auctores antiquissimi*, vol. 12. Recensuit Th. Mommsen. Berlin, 1894.

Georgius Cedrenus, *Compendium historiarum a mundo condito usque ad imperatorem Isaacum Comnenum. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.* Recensuit Bekker. Bonn, 1838.

Chronicon Paschale, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.* Recensuit Dindorf. Bonn, 1832.

Collectiones, *Codex Theodosianus.* Edidit Gothofredus-Ritter. Leipzig, 1736.

Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes. Ediderunt Th. Mommsen et P. Meyer. Berlin, 1905.

Corpus Juris Civilis. II. *Codex Justinianus.* Recognovit P. Krüger. Berlin, 1906. III. *Novellae.* Recognovit Schöll-Kroll. 1895.

Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Edidit C. Müller. Paris, 1841–83.

Leonis VI Novellae: Jus Graeco-Romanum, vol. III. Edidit Zachariae von Lingenthal. 1857.

Papiri Diplomatici. Edidit G. Marini. Rome, 1805.

Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio. Edidit J. D. Mansi. Florence, 1759–98.

Anna Comnena, *Alexias. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.* Recensuit Schopen. Bonn, 1839.

Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, *De caeremoniis aulae Byzantinae. Corpus scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.* Recensuit Bekker. Bonn, 1829.

De administrando imperio. Id. 1840.

Corippus, *Libri qui supersunt. Monumenta Germaniae Historiae. Auctores antiquissimi*, vol. 3, 2. Recensuit Partsch. Berlin, 1879.

Inscriptions, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.* Berlin, 1863 ff.

Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. Edidit Dessau. Berlin, 1892 ff.

Johannes Lydus, *De magistratibus populi Romani.* Edidit R. Wünsch. Leipzig, 1903.

Digitized by Google

Notitia Dignitatum, Edidit E. Böcking. With notes. Bonn, 1839–53. Edidit O. Seeck. Berlin, 1876.

Philotheus, *Kletorologion.* Edidit J. B. Bury. *British Academy Supplemental Papers*, I. London, 1911.

Procopius Caesariensis, *Opera Omnia.* Edidit Haury. Leipzig, 1905.

Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, *De reditu suo.* Edidit Müller. Leipzig, 1870.

Symmachus, *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt. Monumenta Germanicae Historiae. Auctores antiquissimi*, vol. VI. Edidit O. Seeck. Berlin, 1883.

Theophanes, *Chronographia. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.* Recensuit J. Classen. Bonn, 1839.

Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia.* Id. Recensuit Bekker. Bonn, 1838.

Theophylactus Simocatta, *Historiae.* Id. Vols. 1 and 2. Recensuit Bekker. Bonn, 1834. Vol. 3. Recensuit Büttner-Wobst. 1897.

Zosimus, *Historia Romana.* Edidit L. Mendelssohn. Leipzig. 1887.

II. Modern Works

Bethmann-Hollweg, M. A., *Der römische Civilprozess.* 3 vols. Bonn, 1865–66.

Bury, J. B., *A History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene.* 2 vols. London, 1889.

Imperial Administration in the Ninth Century. British Academy Supplemental Papers, I. London, 1911.

Magistri scriniorum, ἀντιγραφῆς and ῥεφερενδάριοι. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, vol. XXI, 1910.

Cagnat, R., *Hospitium militare*, in Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*, vol. 3, pp. 302 f.

Cosenza, M. E., *Official Positions after Constantine.* Columbia University Dissertation. 1907.

Diehl, Ch., *Études byzantines.* Paris, 1895.

Gelzer, M., *Abriss der byzantinischen Kaisergeschichte.* I. Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. IX, pt. 1. München, 1897.

Grenier, P., *L'empire byzantine: son évolution sociale et politique.* Paris, 1904.

Hessling, D. C., *Essai sur la civilization byzantine.* Paris, 1907.

Hirschfeld, Otto, *Die Agentes in Rebus. Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaft*, 1893 = *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 624 ff. Berlin, 1913.

Die Ranktitel der römischen Kaiserzeit. Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1901 = *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 646 ff.

Hodgkin, T., *Italy and her Invaders.* Vol. 1. Oxford, 1892.

Jullian, C., *Illustres*, in Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire*, vol. 3, pp. 385 f.

Karlowa, O., *Römische Rechtsgeschichte.* Bd. I. *Staatsrecht und Rechtsquellen.* Leipzig, 1885.

Koch, P., *Die byzantinischen Beamtentitel von 400 bis 700.* Jena, 1903.

Lécrevain, Ch., *Le sénat romain depuis Diocletien. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, vol. 28. Paris, 1888.

Mommsen, Th., *Aetius. Hermes*, vol. XXXVI, 1901, pp. 516 ff.

Das römische Militärwesen seit Diocletian. Hermes, vol. XXIV, 1889, pp. 195 ff. = *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 6 (*Historische Schriften*, 3), pp. 206 ff.

Ostgotische Studien. Neues Archiv, vol. XIV, 1889, pp. 225 ff., 453 ff.; vol. XV, 1890, 181 ff. = *Historische Schriften*, vol. 3, pp. 362 ff.

Digitized by Google

Pernice, A., *L'imperatore Eraclio.* Firenze, 1905.

Reid, J. S., *The Reorganization of the Empire. Cambridge Mediaeval History*, vol. 1, chap. 2, 1911.

Schiller, H., *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit.* 3 vols. Gotha, 1883–87.

Schlumberger, G., *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin.* Paris, 1884.

Seeck, O., *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt.* 5 vols. Berlin, 1895–1911.

Quaestiones de Notitia Dignitatum. Berlin, 1872.

Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Stuttgart, 1894 ff.: Articles on *Admissionales*, *Barbaricarii*, *Castrensiani*, *Comites*, *Domesticus*, *Fabricae.*

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX A

REFERENCES TO THE TITLE *MAGISTER* IN INSCRIPTIONS AND IN LITERATURE

For the convenience of those who may wish to pursue the subject further, the references to the *Magistri* in both the literature and the inscriptions are here brought together in a classified list.

Magister Populi

Cicero, *De finibus*, 3, 75; *De legibus*, 3, 9, and 3, 10; *De republica*, 1, 63.
Paulus Diaconus, *Epitome Festi*, p. 198 M.
Seneca, *Epistulae*, 108, 31.
Varro, *De lingua latina*, 5, 82.
Velius Longus, *De orthographia*, p. 2234 P.

Magister Equitum

C.I.L. I, 197 (133–118 B.C.); 198 (122 B.C.);
p. 287, *xxvii* (after 309 B.C.);
p. 288, *xxix* (after 296 B.C.); p. 448, *anno* 707 (47 B.C.);
p. 425 ff. = I², part 1, p. 16 ff. (*Fasti Consulares Capitolini*);
pp. 633 ff. = I², part 1, pp. 345 ff. Here may be found a list of eponymous and other magistrates, arranged by Mommsen; cf. the list of the *magistri equitum* given by Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*, vol. 3, p. 1524.
Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità, 1904, p. 9 (320–319 B.C.).

Magister Auctionis

Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, 1, 1, 3, and 6, 1, 15; *Ad familiares*, 12, 30; *Pro Quinctio*, 15, 50.
C.I.L. I, 200, v. 57 (*Lex Agraria* of 111 B.C.).
Digesta, XLVI, 8, 9 (here styled *magister universitatis*).
Gaius, *Institutiones*, 3, 79.
Quintilian, *Institutiones oratoriae*, 6, 3, 51.

Magister Bibendi

Apuleius, *Apologia*, 98.
Cicero, *De Senectute*, 14, 46: *magisteria*.
Martial, *Epigrammata*, 12, 48, 15 (*magistri cenarum*).
Varro, *De lingua latina*, 5, 122; *Rerum humanarum liber*, XX, *apud Nonium Marcellum*, 142, 8.

Digitized by Google

Other designations of the *magister bibendi* are:

arbiter, Horace, *Carmina*, 2, 7, 25;
rex, *op. cit.*, 1, 4, 18, and Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 2, 1, 3;
modiperator, Nonius Marcellus, p. 142, 8;
strategus, Plautus, *Stichus*, 5, 4, 20.

Ludimagistri

Under this head are cited references to *magistri ludi* and other *magistri* acting as professional instructors in any art or science. Figurative usages of the title *magister* have not been included.

(Pseudo) Asconius, *On Cicero, De divinatione*, 14: *magistri ludi.*
Augustine, *Confessiones*, 1, 3, 1: *primi magistri.*
Ausonius, *Epigrammata*, 28, 1; *magister* (*philosophiae*); 138, 1 and 3: *magister* (*grammaticus*).
Epistolae, 4, 95: *magister* (*praeceptor*).
Gratiarum Actio pro consulatu, §§ 31 and 32: *magister* (*praeceptor*).
Idyllia, 4, 3 and 26, and 5, 2: *magister* (*ludi*); 4, 87: *magister* (*praeceptor*).
Professores, 3, 1: *magister* (*rhetor*); 8, 9: *magister* (*grammaticus*).
Praefatiunculae, 2, 29: *magistri* (*rhetores*).
Boetius, *Ars geometrica, de ratione abaci: magister* (*philosophiae*).
De institutione musica, 1, 33: *magister* (*id.*).
Bulletin de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France, 1891, p. 266: *magister* (*eloquentiae*), Hippo Diarrytus.
Cicero, *De inventione*, 1, 25, 35: *magistri artium liberalium.*
De oratore, 3, 23, 86: *magister* (*armorum.*)
De senectute, 5, 13: *magistri* (*eloquentiae*).
9, 29, *magistri bonarum artium.*
De Senectute Philippicae, 2, 17, 43: *magister* (*ludi*).
Codex Theodosianus, XIII, 3, 5 (362 A.D.) = *Codex Justinianus*, X, 53, 7: *magistri studiorum.*
Columella, *De re rustica*, 1, *pr.*, 3, *magister* (*placitae disciplinae*).
4, 28, 2, *magistri* (*rerum rusticarum*).
12, 2, *magister* (*chori canentium*).
Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, V, 604, 42 and 635, 54: *magister ludi.*
II, 126, 6 and 276, 12; also III, 25, 21, and 352, 4, and 455, 31, and 410, 57, and 514, 55; *magister* (*ludi*, διδάσκαλος).
III, 277, 30: *magister* (ἐξηγήτης, *praeceptor*).
C.I.L. II, 5181, l. 57, Metallum Vepascense (first century A.D.): *ludi magistri.*
III, p. 831, 7, l. 66 (*Edictum Diocletiani de pretiis rerum*, 301 A.D.): *magistri litterarum.*
VI, 9529, Rome: *m*]*agister ludi litt*(*erarii*).
VI, 9530, Rome: *ma*]*gister ludi.*
VI, 9858, Rome (after 425 A.D.): *magister eloquentiae.*
VI, 10,008, 10,012, 10,013, 10,015, 10,017, Rome: *magister* (*ludi* or *artium liberalium*).
VIII, 12,418, Aquaeductus Carthaginiensis: *magister iuris.*
IX, 4226, Amiternum, *mag*(*ister*) *ludi.*

Digitized by Google

X, 3969, Capua, *magister ludi litterarii.*
X, 8387, Frusino, *magister iuris.*
Digesta, L, 13, 1 : *magistri ludi litterarii.*
L, 5, 2, 8 : *magistri* (*ludi*).
Festus, *Epitome Pauli*, 126 M : *magistri* (*doctores artium*).
Florus, *Epitome*, 4, 2, 60 : *magister* (*artium liberalium*).
Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, 19, 9, 2 : *magister* (*docendis publice iuvenibus*).
Historia Augusta, *Vita Aureliani*, 30, 3 : *magister ad graecas litteras.*
Vita Caracallae, 1, 8 : *magistri* (*praeceptores*).
Vita Commodi, 1, 7 : *magistri disciplinarum.*
Vita Diadumeni, 8, *magister* (*praeceptor*).
Vita Heliogabali, 16, 4 : *magister* (*praeceptor*).
Vita Marci, 2, 2 : *magistri ad prima elementa;*
2, 7 : *magister* (*praeceptor*);
3, 5 : *magistri* (*artium liberalium*);
4, 9 : *magister* (*pingendi*);
16, 5 : *magistri* (*philosophiae*).
Vita Maximianorum Duorum, 27, 3 : *magister ad primam disciplinam.*
Vita Taciti, 6, 5 : *magistri litterarii.*
Horace, *Carmina*, 1, 18, 13 : *magister* (*ludi*);
1, 1, 14 and *Sermones*, 2, 3, 257 : *magister* (*philosophiae*).
Ars Poetica, 415 : *magister* (*musicae*).
Justin, *Trogi Pompei, Historiarum Philippicarum Epitoma*, 16, 5, 13 : *magister* (*philosophiae*).
Juvenal, *Satirae*, 5, 122 : *magister* (*ludi*).
Martial, *Epigrammata*, 7, 64, 7 and 9, 68, 1, and 10, 62, 1 : *ludi magister.*
1, 35, 2, and 5, 56, 1 and 84, 2, and 8, 3, 15 and 9, 29, 7 : *magister* (*ludi*).
14, 80, 1 : *magistri* (*ludi*);
7, 67, 8 : *magister* (*palaestrae*);
1, 104, 10 and 2, 75, 1 : *magister* (*exercitator*);
1, 42, 12 : *magister* (*saltandi*).
Persius, *Satirae*, 3, 46 : *magister* (*ludi*);
4, 1 : *magister* (*philosophiae*).
Petronius, *Satyricon*, 3, 4 : *magister eloquentiae;*
29 : *magister* (*palaestrae*);
99 : *magister bonarum artium.*
Plautus, *Bacchides*, ll. 152, 404, 439 and 566 : *magister* (*praeceptor*).
Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, 9, 40 : *magister* (*ludi*);
10, 89, 822 and 13, 2 : *magister* (*doctrinae christianae*).
Quintilian, *Institutiones oratoriae*, 2, 1, 13; 2, 8, 7 and 10, 3, 1 : *magister dicendi;*
2, 1, 3 : *magister declamandi;*
2, 5, 5 : *magister eloquentiae;*
5, 11, 17; 5, 14, 32, and 12, 6, 7 : *magister* (*eloquentiae*);
1, 2, 11 and 2, 4, 8 : *magister* (*praeceptor*);
2, 17, 33 : *magister* (*armorum*);
12, 1, 36 : *magister* (*sapientiae*);
10, 2, 6 : *magister* (*cuiusquam rei*).

Digitized by Google

Seneca, *Dialogi*, 2, 11, 3: *magister* (*ludi*);
De beneficiis, 5, 25, 6: *ludi magister.*
Suetonius, *De grammaticis*, 23.
Tacitus, *Annales*, 12, 8 and 14, 52: *magister* (*praeceptor*);
13, 66: *magistri* (*praeceptores*);
6, 20: *magister* (*artis Chaldaeorum*).
Historiae, 4, 10: *magister* (*sapientiae*).
Terence, *Andria*, l. 54: *magister* (*praeceptor*).
Varro, *Apud Nonium Marcellum*, p. 448: *magister* (*ludi* or *artium liberalium*).
Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*, 3, *pr.*, and 3, *magister armorum.*
Virgil, *Aeneis*, 8, 515: *magister* (*praeceptor*).
5, 669, and 9, 172: *magistri* (*praeceptores*).
Georgica, 4, 283: *magister* (*rei rusticae*).

Magister Navis

Ausonius, *Mosella*, 204.
Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, II, 126, 11; 356, 20, and 419, 21;
IV, 363, 8 and 9;
V, 114, 58.
C.I.L. XIV, 2028, Ostia.
Digesta, XIV, 1, 1, pr., 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24;
XIV, 1, 4, 1, 3, and XIV, 1, 5 pr., 1; also XIV, 1, 7, and XIV, 2, 2 pr., 6, 7;
XIX, 2, 13, 2;
XXXIX, 4, 11, 2.
Gaius, *Institutiones*, 4, 71.
Horace, *Carmina*, 3, 6, 31.
Juvenal, *Satirae*, 4, 45; 12, 79.
Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, 29, 25, 7.
Lucan, *Pharsalia*, 2, 696.
Martial, *Epigrammata*, 10, 104, 16.
Silius Italicus, *Punica*, 4, 717.
Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica*, 1, 18, and 382; 2, 391; 3, 109: 4, 269; 8, 202.
Vegetius, *Epitoma Rei Militaris*, 4, 43.
Virgil, *Aeneis*, 1, 115; 5, 176, 224, and 867; 6, 353.

Magister Operum

Columella, *De re rustica*, 1, 8, 17 and 18; 1, 9, 1 and 2.
Styled *magistri singulorum officiorum*, 1, 8, 11, and 11, 1, 27.

Magister Pecoris

Ausonius, *Epigrammata*, 58, 5.
Cicero, *In Verrem*, 5, 7.
Columella, *De re rustica*, 7, 6, 9.
Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1, 4, 6.
Servius, *In Vergilii Aeneida*, 7, 485.
Varro, *De re rustica*, 1, 2, 14; 2, 1, 23; 2, 2, 20; 2, 3, 8; 2, 10, 2 and 5, also 10.

Digitized by Google

Virgil, *Aeneis*, 12, 717.
Eclogae, 3, 101.
Georgica, 2, 529; 3, 445.

Here follow references to other *magistri*, intrusted with the care and training of animals.

Apuleius, *Florida*, 12.
Metamorphosis, 7, 27; 10, 17, also 23 and 35.
Boetius, *De consolatione philosophiae*, 3, 2, 10.
Horace, *Epistulae*, 1, 2, 64.
Juvenal, *Satirae*, 14, 246.
Martial, *De spectaculis*, 10, 1 and 17, 3, and 18, 1 and 22, 1.
Epigrammata, 14, 80, 1.
Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, 11, 91.
Silvius Italicus, *Punica*, 4, 614.
Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*, 3, 24.
Virgil, *Georgica*, 3, 118 and 185.

Magister Societatis

Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, 5, 15, and 11, 10 (*promagister*).
Ad Familiares, 13, 9, 2, and 65, 1 (*promagister*).
In Verrem, 2, 70, 169 (*promagister*), 71, 173, and 74, 182; also 3, 71, 167 and 168.
Paulus Diaconus, *Epitome Festi*, 126 M.

Magister Tabernae

Digesta, XIX, 2, 13, 4.
Paulus, *Sententiae*, 2, 8, 3.

Magister Pagi

Bulletin archéologique du Comité des Travaux historiques, 1894, p. 344, pagus Thigillavensium (Hadrian); 1909, p. 78, Announa.
Calpurnius, *Ecloga*, 4, 125.
Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, II, 126, 9.
C.I.L. I, 801, 802, 804; XIV, 2105; VI, 32, 455 (Rome). All these inscriptions are from the close of the first century B.C.
III, 7484, Ainan Chisi (Moesia Inferior); III, 7847, Micia (Dacia).
V, 4148, *pagus Farracticanensis*.
VIII, 5683, 5705, 19, 135, Sigus; 5884 (*magistratus*), 19,199, Sila; 6267–71, 6273–97, Phua; 6339, Azelis; 7070, uncertain *pagus* near Cirta; 17257 (= 10,833), 198 A.D., and 17,258, after 201 A.D., Zattara; 18,896, 18,900, Thibilis.
IX, 726, Larinum; 3046 (?), *pagus Interprominus*; 3137 (= I, 1280), 3138 (= I, 1279), Lavernae; 3440, Petuinum; 3521, Furfo; 4206, 4208, Septaquae; 5814, Montefano.
X, 814, 853, 1042, 1074 c, 924 (*ministri*), Pompeii; 3772 (= I, 571), 94 B.C., *pagus Herculaneus*.
XI, 1947, 1948, Perusia; 3040, 4–3 B.C., *pagus Stellatinus*; 3196 (*et magister*), Nepete.

Digitized by Google

XII, 5370, *inter Narbonem et Tolosam.*
XIII, 5, Consoranni; 412, *civitas Trebellorum;* 604, Burdegala; 1670, *pagus Condate;* 2507, Ambarri.
Ephemeris Epigraphica, 8, 474, *conventus Capuae.*
Notizie degli Scavi, 1899, p. 474 (*magistra*), Liguria.
Paulus Diaconus, *Epitome Festi*, 126 and 371 M.
Recueil de la Société archéologique de Constantine, 1901, p. 162, Phua.
Siculus Flaccus, *De condicionibus agrorum*, pp. 146, 164.
Mitteilungen des deutschen archaeologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung, 1914, p. 130, Laira.

Magister Vici

Asconius, *In Pisonianam*, 6.
Bulletin de la Société archéologique bulgare, I, 1910, p. 116.
Bulletino Communale di Roma, 1888, p. 328, Rome.
Bulletino dell' Instituo di Diritto Romano, 1906, p. 115 (*ministri*), 2 B.C., Rome.
Cicero, *In Pisonem*, 4, 8.
Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, III, 298, 49 and 50; 525, 4.
C.I.L. I, 1237, Puteoli.
IV, 60, Pompeii.
V, 1890, Concordia; 8211, Aquileia.
VI, 1324, 23 B.C.; 2221 (I, 804), before 12 B.C.; 33, 2 B.C.; 34, 3 B.C.; 35, 45–46 A.D.; 128, 6 B.C.; 282, 4 A.D.; 283, 7–6 B.C.; 445, 446, 447 (*ministri*); 448, 4 B.C.; 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 760, 761, 763, 764, 765, 767, 801, 802, 2222, 150 A.D.; 975, 135 A.D., 2223, 2224, 2225, 2225 *a*, 2226, 2227, 2228: Rome.
IX, 4120, Aequiculi; 3435 (*aediles*), *Peltuinum.*
XI, 851, Mutina; 3585, Castrum Novum; 4798, 4815, 4821, Spoletum; 6013, Sentinum; 6237, Fanum Fortunum; 6359, 6362, 6367, Pisaurum.
XII, 5370, *ad Narbonem.*
XIII, 4310, *vicus Bodatius;* 4316, *ad Mogontiacum.*
XIV, 2263, *ager Albanus.*
Curiosum Urbis Regionum, XIV. *Passim.* After 357 A.D.
Ephemeris Epigraphica, IV, 746, 747, Rome.
VII, 12–77, Rome.
IX, 470, Castia; 685, *ager Tusculanus.*
Martial, Epigrammata, 10, 79.
Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, 34, 7, 2.
Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità, 1914, p. 362, 70 A.D., Rome.
Notitia Regionum Urbis XIV. Passim. 334–337 A.D.
Paulus Diaconus, *Epitome Festi*, 126 and 371 M.
Urbs Constantinopolitana Nova Roma. Passim. 408–450 A.D.

Magister Vici Canabensium

Archaeologische Epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn, 8, p. 32, Küstendje.

Digitized by Google

C.I.L. III, 1008, Apulum; 6162, 6166, 6167, Troesmis; 14,409, 14,412, *vicus Trullensium;* 14,214, 26, *vicus Ulmetus.*
VII, 12, Regni; 333, Aurula; 346 (?), Old Carlisle.

MAGISTER CONVENTUS VICANI

C.I.L. II, 2636, Asturica; 2782, Clemia; 3408, Carthago Nova; 5007, *ager Olisiponensis.*
III, 1533, Jonic; 1820, Narona; 3776, 3777, Nauportus; 7536, near Toni.
V, 1829, 1830, Julium Caricum.

MAGISTER MUNICIPII

C.I.L. XI, 863, Mutina.

MAGISTER CASTELLI

C.I.L. VIII, 6272, 6297, 6299, Phua; 6044, Arsacal; 9317, *ad Tipasam.*

MAGISTER CURIAE

C.I.L. VIII, 11,008, Hr Zian; 14,683, 185 A.D., Smitthus.
Plautus, *Aulularia*, 1, 2, 29, and 2, 2, 3.
(Pseudo) Asconius, *In Verronianam*, 1, 8, 22.

MAGISTER FANI

(*a*) In *pagi* of the *ager Campanus*

C.I.L. X, 3772 (= I, 571), 94 B.C.; 3774 (= I, 564), 112–111 B.C.; 3775, 110 B.C.; 3776–3777 (= I, 565), 108 B.C.; 3778 (= I, 567), 106 B.C.; 3779 (= I, 566), 106 B.C.; 3780 (= I, 568), 104 B.C.; 3781 (= I, 569); 3782 (= I, 572), before 71 B.C.; 3783 (= I, 573), 71 B.C.; 3784 (= I, 575); 3785 (= I, 574); 3786, 15 A.D.; 3787.
Ephemeris Epigraphica, VIII, 473, 474.
Notizie degli Scavi, 1893, p. 164.

(*b*) In *conventus vicani*

C.I.L. II, 3433, 3434, Carthago Nova.
III, 1769, 1770, 1792, 1798, 1799, 1801, 1802, 1827 (?), Narona.
V, 1830, Julium Caricum.
XII, 5388, Tolosa.

(*c*) In the Roman *conventus* at Delos

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, I, p. 87, no. 36, *ca.* 100 B.C.
IV, p. 190, 97 B.C.
XXVI, p. 536, 112–111 B.C.
XXXI, p. 439, no. 30, 97 B.C., and p. 442, no. 33.
XXXIII, p. 493, no. 15, 113 B.C., and p. 496, no. 16, *ca.* 100 B.C.; also p. 501, no. 17, and p. 503, no. 18, 57–56 B.C.
XXXIV, p. 402, no. 53, 150–125 B.C., and p. 404, no. 54, *ca.* 100 B.C.
C.I.L. III, 7212 (= *BCH.* VIII, p. 118); 7217 (= *BCH.* VIII, p. 97), *ca.* 150 B.C.; 7218 (= *BCH.* I, p. 285), before 150 B.C.; 7225 (= *BCH.* VIII, p. 145); 7226 (= *BCH.* VIII, p. 186); 14,203[4] (= *BCH.* XXIII, p. 56).

Digitized by Google

(*d*) In municipalities

C.I.L. I, 1345, Cosmum Puerinum.
II, 5349, 128, *lex Coloniae Genetivae Juliae*, Urso.
V, 8251, 8258, Aquileia.
VI, 335, *magister Herculis;* 30,888, *magistri Herculis*, Rome.
IX, 1456, *magistri Bellonae*, Ligures Baebiani; 1534, Beneventum; 2362, 2363, 2365, *magistri sacrorum Iunonis Augustae*, Allifae.
X, 3918, 3924, Capua; 4620, Culbuteria; 5388, Aquinum; 6073, *magistri Iovis Optimi Maximi*, Formiae.
XI, 6108, *magistri Apollinis*, Forum Sempronii; 2360, Cosa.
XII, 4525, Narbo.
XIV, 2982, Praeneste.

MAGISTRAE FANI

C.I.L. V, 5026, Tridentum; 8253, Aquileia.
X, 39, *magistrae Proserpinae*, Vibo, and 6511, *Magistrae Matris Matutae*, Cora.
XI, 2630, Cosa; 3246, *magistrae Minervae*, Sutrium.
XIV, 2997, 3006, *magistrae Matris Matutae*, Praeneste.

MINISTRI FANI

C.I.L. III, 1967, 1968, 8690: *ministri ad Tritones*, Salonae.
V, 3101, Vicita; 5026, Tridentum; 8253, Aquileia.
VIII, 6961, *ministri dei Saturni*, Cirta.
X, 824–827, 3 to 58 A.D., *ministri Fortunae Augustae*, Pompeii; 884–893, *ministri Augusti*, Pompeii. Of the inscriptions recording *ministri Augusti* the following are datable: 884, 25 B.C.; 885–6, 14 B.C.; 890, 2 B.C.; 891, 1 B.C.; 892, 3 A.D.; 895, 23 A.D.; 898, 31 A.D.; 899, 32 A.D.; 901–2, 34 A.D.
XIV, 2982, Praeneste.
Notizie degli Scavi, 1902, p. 470, Corfinium.

MAGISTER LARUM AND MAGISTER LARUM AUGUSTI

C.I.L. II, 2013, Singila; 2181, Adamuz; 2233, Corduba; 3563, Lucentum; 3113, Cabeza del Griego; 4293, 4297, 4304, 4306, 4307, 4309, 6106, Tarraco.
V, 792, Aquileia; 3257, 3258 (?), 1 B.C., Verona.
IX, 2825, Histonium; 423, Venusia; 3424, Peltuinum; 3657, Marsi Maruvium; 6293, Caudium.
X, 773, Stabiae; 1582, 1 A.D., Puteoli; 5761, 6 B.C; 5762, 2 B.C., Casinum; 6556, 6557, Veletriae; 7514, Sardinia.
XI, 804, Bonnonia; 2998, Viterbo.
XII, 406, 18–19 A.D., Massilia.

MINISTRI LARUM AND LARUM AUGUSTI

C.I.L. V, 3257, Verona.
IX, 3657, Marsi Maruvium.
X, 137, Potentia; 205, Grumentum; 1269, Nola; 3789 (= I, 570), 94 B.C. and 3790, 26 B.C., Capua; 7953, Sardinia.
XIV, 3562, Tibur.

Digitized by Google

Competaliasti at Delos

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, XXIII, pp. 62, 63, 64, 99–98 B.C.; 67, 94 B.C.; 70, 93 B.C.
VII, p. 13, 97–96 B.C.
XXXI, p. 441, 98–94 B.C.
XXXIII, p. 505.

Magister Fundi

C.I.L. VIII, 11,217, *fundus Iubaltianensis*, 295–305 A.D.

Magister Saltus

C.I.L. VIII, 10,570, *saltus Burunitanus*, 180–183 A.D.

Magister Fratrum Arvalium

Bullettino Communale, 1911, p. 129 ff., 239 A.D.
C.I.L. VI, 970; 2023–2119, 14, 241 A.D.; 32,379, 32,340, 32,344, 32,352, 32,374.
Cf. Henzen, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, and Gatti, *Arvales* in Di Ruggiero's *Dizionario Epigrafico*, vol. I, pp. 682 ff. The latter has a list of the Masters and Vice-Masters.

Magister Haruspicum

C.I.L. VI, 2161, Rome.
XI, 4194, Interamna.
XIV, 164, Ostia.

Magister Collegi Lupercorum

C.I.L. X, 6488, Ulubrae.
XIV, 2105 (= I, 805), Lanuvium.
Notizie degli Scavi, 1898, p. 406.

Magister Pontificum

C.I.L. VI, 1422, after 212 A.D.; 1700; 2120, 155 A.D.; 2158, after 382 A.D., *promagistri*, Rome.
X, 1125, after Constantine I, *promagister*, Abellinum.
VIII, 7115, and 7123, *magistri*, Cirta.

Magister XVvirum Sacris Faciundis

C.I.L. I², part 1, p. 29.
VI, 32,323, 29 and 57, 17 B.C.; 32,326, 6; 32,328, 15; 32,332, 2, 203–204 A.D.
X, 3698, 289 A.D., and 6422, 213 A.D., *promagistri*.
Monumentum Ancyranum, 4, 36–37.
Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, 28, 2.
Tacitus, *Annales*, 6, 12.

Magister Saliorum

C.I.L. II, 3864, 3865, Saguntum.
VI, 2170, Alba.
Historia Augusta, *Vita Aureliani*, 4, 4.
Valerius Maximus, *Memorabilia*, 1, 1, 9.

Digitized by Google

Magister Sodalium Augustalium Claudialium

C.I.L. VI, 1985, 1986, and 1987, 213–2, 14 A.D. (= XIV, 2388–91).

Magister Augustales

C.I.L. III, 862, and 912, Napoca.
V, 6775 and 6784, Alba Pompeia; 7646 *ager Salusensis.*
IX, 20, Lupiae; 423, Venusia; 1048, *ager Compsimus;* 5020, Hadria.
X, 1209, Abella; 1404 (?), Herculaneum; 1055, Pompeii; 6114, Formiae; 7552 and 7601 (?), Carales.
XI, 1026, *a*, and 1029, Brixellum; 1061, Parma; 1604, 1606, 1611, and 1614, *a*, Florentia; 2631, Cosa; 3083, and 3135, Falerii; 3200, 12 B.C., Nepete; 4581, Carsulae.
XIV, 2974, Praeneste.

Magister Capitolinorum

C.I.L. VI, 2105, Rome
X, 6488, Ulubrae

Magister Cerialium

C.I.L. IX, 2835 and 2857, Histonium.
Bulletin Archaéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques, 1909, procès-verbaux, pp. *xvii*, *xviii*, Trinesia.
Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Inscriptiones et Belles-Lettres, 1910, p. 135 (near Carthage).

Magister Martinus

Cicero, *Pro Cluentio*, 15, 43 (*ministri Martis*).
C.I.L. IX, 4068, *a*, and 4070, Carsioli.

Magister Mercurialis

C.I.L. III, 1769, 1770, 1775, 1792, 1799, 1801, 1802, and 1827, *IIIIIIII viri magistri Mercuriales*, Narona.
IX, 54, *et Augustalis*, Brundisium.
X, 1152, Arbellinum, 1272, *Augustalis*, Nola; 3773 (?), Capua; 4589 and 4591, *Augustalis*, Caratia.
XI, 1417, Pisa.
Notizie degli Scavi, 1901, p. 26, *Augustalis*, Viggiano in Bruttium.

Magister Herculaneus

C.I.L. XIV, 3658, 3665, and 3681, *et Augustalis*, Tibur.
Notizie degli Scavi, 1910, p. 298, Sora.

Magister Collegii Minervae

Suetonius, *Vita Domitiani*, 4, 4.

Digitized by Google

Magistri of Unofficial Religious and Funerary Colleges

Apollo and the Genius Augusti

C.I.L. IX, 804, Bonnonia.

Bacchus

C.I.L. X, 104 (= I, 196), *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*, 186 B.C., *Ager Teuranus.*

Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, 39, 18, 9.

Bona Dea

C.I.L. V, 759 (cf. 757, 8), and 762, *magistrae*, Aquileia.
V, 5026, 2, Tridentum.
VI, 2239, Rome.
XI, 3866 and 3869, Capua.
XIV, 3437, Civitella.

Diana and Antinous

C.I.L. X, 2112, col. 1, *magister collegii;* col. 2, 8, and 14, *magistri cenarum*, 133–136, 6 A.D., Lanuvium.

Genius of Pannonia Superior

C.I.L. III, 4168, 228 A.D., Savaria.

Hercules

C.I.L. III, 1339, Veczel.
IX, 3424, Peltuinum.
IX, 3907 (= I, 1172) (?), Alba Fucens.
IX, 3857, Supinum.

Juppiter Cernenus

C.I.L. III, p. 295 f., Alburnum Maius.

Juno

C.I.L. X, 202, *magistra*, Grumentum.

Mars Ficanus Augustus

C.I.L. XIV, 309, Ostia.

Mater Deum and Navis Salvia

C.I.L. VI, 494, Rome.

Mens Bona

C.I.L. I, 1237, Naples.
X, 472, Paestum.
X, 1550, Puteoli.
X, 5512, 6513, and 6514, Cora.
XIV, 3564, Tibur.

Mithras

C.I.L. V, 5511, Lacus Verbanus.
VI, 47, 556, 717, 734, 1675, and 2151, Rome.

Minerva Medica (?)

Orelli, *Inscriptiorum Latinarum Selectarum Collectio*, 2634, *magister odariarius*, Rome.

Digitized by Google

Obsequens Dea

C.I.L. V, 814, *magistra*, Aquileia.

Silvanus

C.I.L. X, 444, *vallis Silari superioris.*

Silvanus Martius

Mitteilungen des archaeologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung, 1908, p. 37, 39 B.C., Cervetri.

Venus

C.I.L. III, 1963, 1969, and 1971, *magistrae*, Salonae.

Uncertain Colleges

C.I.L. III, 4150, Savaria.
V, 1890, Concordia.
V, 8750, *magister primus de numero erolorum seniorum*, Concordia.
VI, 813, Rome.
VI, 10,301, 10,303, 10,305, 10,306, 10,308, 10,310, 10,311, 10,312, 10,313, 10,314, 10,315, 10,316, 10,317, 10,318, 10,319, and 10,320, Rome.
IX, 1948, Perusia.
IX, 3359, Piuna.
X, 4847, 32 A.D., Venafrum.
XI, 715, *magistralis*, Bonnonia.
XI, 1417 (*Mercuriales?*), Pisa.
XI, 2132, Elusium.
XIV, 2847, 2870, 2883, 2894, and 3027, Praeneste.
Notizie degli Scavi, 1909, p. 312, no. 17, Rome.

Magistri in Collegia Domestica

C.I.L. II, 2229, Corduba.
VI, 188, 236, 4051, *magisterium*, 6214, 6316, 6376, 8512, and 9409, Rome.
VI, 10,395, *fasti* of a college in the *familia Augusta*, 4 B.C.–1 A.D., Rome.
VI, 8639, *fasti officialium domus Augustae*, 48–50, and 65–69 A.D., *magistri* and *magistrae*, Rome.
X, 3942, Capua.
X, 6638 (= I, p. 327), *fasti collegii vernarum*, 38–51 A.D., Antium.
X, 6679, Antium.
XII, 3356 and 3637, Nemausus.
XIII, 1550, Putaeni.
XIV, 3015, Praeneste.
Notizie degli Scavi, 1901, p. 99, and 1902, p. 56, Rome.

Magistri in Colleges of Artizans and Tradesmen

Aeditui

C.I.L. XIV, 2637, Tusculum.

Aerarii

Bulletino communale di Roma, 1904, p. 49, Rome.

Digitized by Google

Apparitores

C.I.L. VI, 9861, 9862, and 9863, *magistri quinquennales*, Rome.

Aromatorii

C.I.L. VI, 384, *magistri quinquennales*, Rome.

Artifices

C.I.L. VI, 9927, Rome.

Centonarii

C.I.L. III, 4496, *a*, 243 A.D., Carnutum.
V, 3411, and 3439, Verona.
VI, 7861, and 7862, *magistri quinquennales*, Rome.
XI, 970, Rhegium.
XI, 1354, 255 A.D., Luna.
XII, 2754, *ager Volcarus*.

Cisiarii

C.I.L. XIV, 2874, Praeneste.

Coques atrienses

C.I.L. XIV, 2875, Praeneste.

Coques Falisci

C.I.L. XI, 3078, Second century B.C., Sardinia.

Dendrophori

C.I.L. V, 7904, Nicia.
XIV, 309, Ostia.

Fabri and Fabri tignuarii

C.I.L. III, 3580, 201 A.D., Acquincum.
III, 1016, 1097 (?), Apulum.
III, 8086, Ratiaria, time of Severus and Caracalla.
III, 8819 and 14,243, Salonae.
V, 4489, Brixia.
V, 5310, *magister officiorum collegii fabrum*, and 5272, Comum.
VI, 148 and 321, *magistri quinquennales*, Ostia.
VI, 996, 7, and 9406, Rome.
VIII, 2690, Lambaesis.
IX, 5450, Falerii.
IX, 5754, Ricina.
XI, 126, Ravenna.
XI, 970, *magistri fabrum et centonariorum*, 190 A.D., Regium Lepidum.
XI, 5816, *magistri quinquennales*, Inguvium.
XII, 68, Salinae.
XII, 719 and 738, Arelate.
XII, 1191, Vienna.
XIV, 5, 128, 160, 299, 370, 371, 374, 407, 418, 430, and 2630: *magistri quinquennales*, Ostia.
XIV, 3009, *magistri quinquennales*, Praeneste.
Klio, 1910, p. 496, Sarmizegetusa.
Notizie degli Scavi, 1903, p. 217, Novara.

Digitized by Google

Farmacopuli

C.I.L. V, 4489, Brixia.

Fullones, Fontani, Magistri Fontis, Collegia Aquae

C.I.L. VI, 154, 123 A.D.; 155, 69 A.D.; 156, 105 A.D.; 157, 131 A.D.; 158, 131, 40 A.D.; 159, 140 A.D.; 160, 160 *a*, 161, 162, 160 A.D.; 163, 165, 268, 57 A.D.; 10,298, 1 *b*, 2, 5, 8, 9, 15, and 17, Rome.
IX, 5450, Falerii.
XI, 4771 (I, 1406), *magistri quinquennales*, Spoletum.
XIII, 8345, Colonia Agrippensium.

Glutinarii et Topiarii

Bulletino communale di Roma, 1902, p. 99, Tusculum.

Hastiferi

C.I.L. XII, 1814, Vienna.

Horrearii

C.I.L. VI, 108 and 246, Rome.

Incolae et Opifices

C.I.L. XI, 6211, Sena Gallica.

Lani

C.I.L. VI, 167 and 168, Rome.
XIV, 2877, Praeneste.

Lintiones

C.I.L. XI, 3209, Nepete.

Mercatores pecuarii

C.I.L. XIV, 2878, Praeneste.

Mimiarii

C.I.L. III, 3980, Siscia.

Navales

American Journal of Archaeology, 1908, p. 39, Praeneste.

Piscatores et Urinatores

C.I.L. VI, 29,700, 29,701, and 29,702, Rome.

Synhod magna Psaltum

Bulletino Communale di Roma, 1888, p. 408, Rome.

Retiarii

C.I.L. X, 1589, Puteoli.

Sartores

C.I.L. VIII, 7158, Cirta.

Scaenici Latini

C.I.L. XIV, 2299, Albanum.

Tibicines

C.I.L. VI, 3696 and 3877, *magistri quinquennales*, Rome.

Digitized by Google

Utricularii

C.I.L. XII, 719, Arelate.
XII, 3351, Nemausus.

Viatores

C.I.L. VI, 1933, *magister trium decuriarum*, and 1942 (= 7446), Rome.

Omnia Collegia

C.I.L. V, 4449, *qui magisterio eorum functi sunt*, Brixia.

Magistri Iuventutis, or Iuvenum

C.I.L. III, 4272, Brigetio.
V, 8211, Aquileia.
IX, 4457 and 4520, *ager Amiternius.*
IX, 4545 and 4549, Nursia.
IX, 4691 and 4696, Reate.
IX, 4753 and 4754, *vallis Canera.*
IX, 4883, 4885, 4888, 4889, Trebula Mutuesca.
XI, 3938, Lucus Feroniae.
XI, 3215, Nepete.
Musée Belge, 1899, pp. 191–192, nos. 32–36, leaden *tesserae* of uncertain provenance. No. 34 dates from the time of Nero.

Magistri Collegii Veteranorum

Archaeologische Epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn, 1884, p. 76, Carnutum.
C.I.L. III, 4496, *a*, Carnutum.
IX, 3907 (= I, 1172), Alba Fucens.

Ministri in Religious and Funerary Colleges

College of Mens Bona

C.I.L. X, 4636, Cales.

College of Mithras

C.I.L. XI, 5737, *menesterium*, Sentinum.

College of Saturnus

C.I.L. VIII, 6961, Cirta.

College of Venus

C.I.L. VI. 32,468, Rome.

Collegium funeraticum

C.I.L. VI, 10,311, Rome.

Uncertain Colleges

C.I.L. V, 762, *ministrae*, Aquileia.
XIV, 2982, Praeneste.

Ministri in Colleges of Artizans and Tradesmen

Aerarii

Bulletino Communale di Roma, 1904, p. 49, Rome.

Digitized by Google

Cisiarii

C.I.L. XIV, 2874, Praeneste.

Fullones or Fontani

C.I.L. VI, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 163, and 165, Rome.

MAGISTER XX HEREDITATIUM

Wilmann, *Inscriptiones*, 1293, Lugdunum.

PROMAGISTER XX HEREDITATIUM

C.I.L. VI, 1620, Rome.
VIII, 20,684, Saldae.
IX, 5835, Auximum.
XI, 1326, Luna.

PROMAGISTER HEREDITATIUM

C.I.L. XIII, 1810, Lugdunum.

PROMAGISTER FRUMENTI MANCIPALIS, PROMAGISTER PORTUUM

C.I.L. III, 14,195, 4–13, Ephesus.

MAGISTER PRIVATAE

NOTE. — The principal literary references to this and to the following Masters may be found in *Roman Magistri in the Civil and Military Service of the Empire*, published in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. XXVI (1915), pp. 73 ff.
C.I.L. III, 12,043 and 12,044 (= 13,059), 314 A.D., Crete.
VI, 1630, Rome.
VIII, 822, Turca.

MAGISTER PRIVATAE EGYPTI ET LIBYAE

C.I.L. III, 18, Alexandria.

MAGISTER SUMMARUM RATIONUM

C.I.L. VI, 1618, Rome.
VIII, 822, Turca.

MAGISTER MEMORIAE

C.I.L. VI, 510, 376 A.D.; 1764 and 8621, Rome.
XII, 1524, *ager Vocontiorum.*

MAGISTER EPISTULARUM

C.I.L. VI, 510, 376 A.D., Rome.
Ephemeris Epigraphica, VII, 262, Thubursicum Bure.

MAGISTER LIBELLORUM

C.I.L. VI, 510, 376 A.D., Rome.
X, 4721, *ager Falerinus.*
XII, 1254, *ager Vocontiorum.*

Digitized by Google

MAGISTER SACRARUM COGNITIONUM

C.I.L. V, 8972, Aquileia.
VI, 510, 376 A.D., Rome.

MAGISTER STUDIORUM

C.I.L. VI, 1608, 1704, and 8638, Rome.
X, 4721, *ager Falerinus.*

MAGISTER ADMISSIONUM

C.I.L. XIV, 3457, Sublaqueum.

MAGISTER OFFICIORUM

C.I.L. VI, 1721 (= Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, no. 1244), 355–360 A.D., Rome.
VIII, 989, Missua.
Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, 9043.

MAGISTER BALLISTARIUS

C.I.L. V, 6632, *ager Novariensis.*

MAGISTER COHORTIS

C.I.L. III, 10,307, Intercisa.

MAGISTER EQUITUM

C.I.L. V, 8278, Aquileia.

MAGISTER KAMPI

C.I.L. VIII, 2562, Lambaesis, time of Alexander Severus.

MAGISTER NUMERI

C.I.L. VIII, 21,568, Ala Milaria.

MAGISTER CASTRORUM

C.I.L. VII, 268, Isurium, Fifth century, A.D.
VIII, 4354, 578–582, Ain Ksar.

MAGISTER MILITUM

C.I.L. II, 4320, 598–590 A.D., Carthago Nova.
III, 88, 371 A.D., Arabia Petra; 3653, 371 A.D., Salva; 4668, 4669, and 4670, Carnutum; 5670, *a*, 370 A.D., Fafina; 6399, Salonae; 10,596, 365–367 A.D., Salva; 11,376, Carnutum (cf. Hirschfeld, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 651, n. 3).
V, 8120, 3, Cremona; 8120, 4, about 525 A.D., Milan.
VI, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1731, 1732, 1733, 1734 (nos. 1731–1734 from 405–408 A.D.), 31,914, and 32,050, 589 A.D., Rome.
VIII, 101, time of Justinian, Capsa; 259, time of Justinian, Sufes; 1863, time of Justinian, Themeste; 4354, 578–582 A.D., Ain Ksar; 4677, Madaura, and 4799, Gardianfala, time of Justinian.
IX, 4051, 398–408 A.D., Carseoli.
Dessau, *Inscriptiones Selectae Latinae*, no. 9217 *a* and *b*, Rusguniae, Mauretania.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX B

I. MASTERS OF THE OFFICES TO 700 A.D.

A.D.			
321	Heraclianus	(*Occ.*),	*Codex Theodosianus*, XVI, 10, 1.
323	Proculianus	(*Occ.*),	*Codex Theod.*, XI, 9, 1.
324	Martinianus	(*Or.*),	Aurelius Victor, *Epitome*, XLI, 6; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 25; Zosimus, 2, 25.
324	Palladius		Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 25.
346	Eugenius	(*Occ.*),	Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantinum*, 3; cf. *C.I.L.* VI, 1721.
350–51	Marcellinus	(*Occ.*),	Zosimus, 2, 43, 4; 46, 3; 47, 2.
350–54	Palladius	(*sub Gallo Caesare*),	Ammianus, 22, 3, 3.
355	Florentius	(*Or.*), (*agens pro magistro officiorum*),	Ammianus, 22, 5, 12.
359–360	Florentius	(*Or.*),	Ammianus, 20, 2, 2; 22, 3, 6.
360	Pentadius	(*sub Juliano Caesare*),	Ammianus, 20, 8, 19.
360	Felix	(*Occ.*),	Ammianus, 20, 9, 5.
360	Anatolius	(*Occ.*),	Ammianus, 20, 9, 8; Zosimus, 3, 29, 3; 30, 4.
362	id.		*Codex Theod.*, XI, 39, 5.
363	id.		Magnus Carrhenus, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. IV, p. 5.
365	Ursatius	(*Occ.*),	Ammianus, 26, 5, 7.
365	Euphrasius	(*Or.*),	Ammianus, 26, 7, 4.
366	id.		Ammianus, 26, 10, 8.
Before 368	Ampelius	(*Occ.*),	Ammianus, 28, 4, 3.
368	Leo	(*Occ.*),	Ammianus, 28, 1, 12.
368	Remigius	(*Occ.*),	Ammianus, 27, 9, 2; *Codex Theod.*, VII, 8, 2 (?).
370	id.		Ammianus, 28, 6, 8, and 30.
373	id.		Ammianus, 29, 5, 2.
374	Leo	(*Occ.*),	Ammianus, 30, 2, 10.
375	id.		Ammianus, 30, 5, 10.
376 to 379	Siburius	(*Occ.*),	*Monumenta Germaniae Historiae, Auctores Antiquissimi*, VI, p. *cxxxi*.
379	Syagrius	(*Occ.*),	*Codex Theod.*, I, 15, 10; VII, 12, 2.
380	Florus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 3; VIII, 15, 6.
381	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VI, 29, 6.

Digitized by Google

381	Palladius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, X, 24, 3.
382	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 4.
384	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VII, 8, 3.
382	Macedonius	(*Occ.*),	Severus, *Sacra Historia*, 2, 48.
386	Principius	(*Occ.*),	*Codex Theod.*, I, 9, 2.
389	Caesarius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VIII, 5, 49.
390	Rufinus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, X, 22, 3; Lydus, *De Mag.*, 2, 10; 3, 40.
393	Theodotus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VII, 8, 4.
394	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VII, 1, 14.
395	Marcellus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VI, 29, 8; XVI, 5, 29; *De Medicamentis, tit.*
395 (?)	Hosius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 7.
396	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VI, 26, 6; 27, 8; 27, 9.
398			*Codex Theod.*, VII, 8, 5; X, 22, 4.
397	Hadrianus	(*Occ.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VI, 26, 11.
399	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 11.
404	Anthemius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, XVI, 4, 4; VI, 27, 14; X, 22, 5.
405	Aemilianus		*Codex Theod.*, I, 9, 3; VI, 34, 1.
			400 A.D. (?) *Codex Theod.*, VII, 8, 8.
408	Naemorius	(*Occ.*),	Zosimus, 5, 32, 26.
408	Olympius	(*Occ.*),	*Codex Theod.*, XVI, 5, 42; Zosimus, 5, 35.
409	Johannes	(*Occ.*),	Sozomenus, IX, 8.
410	Gaiso	(*Occ.*),	*Codex Theod.*, IX, 38, 11.
412	Namatius	(*Occ.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 15.
414	Helio	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, XIII, 3, 17.
415	id.		*Codex Theod.*, I, 8, 1; VI, 27, 17.
416	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 18; 26, 17; 33, 1.
417	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 19.
424	id.		Olympiodorus, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. IV, p. 68, ch. 46.
424	id.		*Codex Theod.*, I, 8, 3.
425	id.		Olympiodorus, *F.H.G.*, vol. IV, p. 68, ch. 46.
426	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 30.
427	id.		*Codex Theod.*, VII, 8, 14; XIII, 3, 18.
430	Johannes	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VII, 8, 15.
430	Paulinus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VI, 27, 3; *Chronicon Paschale*, wrongly, 421 and 444.
435	Valerius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Theod.*, VI, 28, 8; VII, 8, 16.
441	Flegetius	(*Or.*),	*Novellae Theodosii*, 21. (*Codex Just.*, I, 31, 3 Phlegetius.)
443	Nomus	(*Or.*),	*Novellae Theod.*, 24.
444	id.		*Novellae Theod.*, 25; *Codex Just.*, I, 24, 4. Undated: *Codex Just.*, XII, 19, 7 and 8; 21, 6; 26, 2.
			449 (?) Priscus, *F.H.G.*, vol. IV, p. 97, fg. 13.

Digitized by Google

448	Martialius	(*Or.*),	Priscus, *F.H.G.*, vol. IV, p. 77, fg. 7.
449	Opilio	(*Occ.*),	*Novellae Valentiniani*, 28.
450	id.		*Novellae Val.*, 30.
451	Vincomalus	(*Or.*),	Mansi, vol. V, pp. 97, 185 ff., 497, 500, 505.
452	id.		*Codex Justinianus*, I, 3, 23 (Calch.); cf. XII, 40, 10.
456	Euphemius	(*Or.*),	Priscus, *F.H.G.*, vol. IV, p. 102.
457	Martialius	(*Or.*),	*De Caer.*, 1, 91.
Between 457 and 470	Patricius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XII, 19, 9; 20, 3 and 5; 50, 22.
id.	Euphemius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XI, 10, 6, and 7.
id.	Johannes	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XII, 5, 3; 25, 3; 59, 8.
470	Hilarianus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, I, 23, 6; XII, 19, 10; 59, 9.
474	id.		*Codex Just.*, XII, 25, 4. Undated: *Codex Just.*, XII, 7, 2; 40, 11.
474	Eusebius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XII, 29, 2. *De Caer.*, 1, 94.
475–477 (?)	Patricius	(*Or.*),	Candidus, pp. 474, 475, Bonn.
Between 474 and 491 (Zeno)	Illyrianus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XII, 40. 11.
	Longinus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XII, 29, 3.
484	Johannes	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XII, 21, 8.
492	Eusebius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, I, 30, 3.
497	id.		*Codex Just.*, II, 7, 20. Undated: *Code. Just.*, XII, 1, 18; 5, 5; 10, 2; 19, 11.
507–511	Eugenes	(*Regni Gothici*),	Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 1, 12, and 13.
517	Celer	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, IV, 29, 21. Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, 1, 8.
518	id.		*De Caer.*, 1, 93. Undated; *Codex Just.*, XII, 19, 12.
520	Tatianus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XII, 19, 14.
522	Hermogenes	(*Or.*),	Theophanes, p. 276, Bonn.
522–523	Boetius	(*Regni Gothici*),	*Anonymus Valesii*, 14, 85.
524	Licinius	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, XII, 33, 5.
523 to 527	Cassiodorus	(*Regni Gothici*),	*Variae;* cf. *M.G.H.*, XII, pp. *x–xi.*
527	Tatianus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, I, 31, 5; XII, 19, 15. *De Caer.*, 1, 95. Undated: *Codex Just.*, XII, 19, 14.
After 527	Cyprianus	(*Regni Gothici*),	*Anonymus Valesii*, 14, 85.
id.	Petronius	(*Regni Gothici*),	*Praescriptio libelli Cassiodorani de stirpe sua.*
528 (?)	Theophilus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, 1 *de Justiniani codice confirmando*, 529 A.D., *ex magister.*
530	Hermogenes	(*Or.*),	Procopius, *De bello Persico*, 1, 13.
532	id.		*Codex Just.*, V, 17, 11.
533	id.		*Chronicon Paschale; Codex Just.*, I, 3, 53; V, 17, 11; VII, 24, 1; IX, 13, 1; XI, 48, 24.

Digitized by Google

533	Trebonianus	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, 1, 17, 2 pr.
534	id.	(*Or.*),	*Codex Just.*, I, *de emendatione Codicis Justiniani;* I, *de novo codice*, 528 A.D.: *magisteria dignitate inter agentes decoratus.*
535	Hermogenes	(*Or.*),	*Novellae Just.*, 2; 10; 138.
536	Trebonianus	(*Or.*),	*Novellae Just.*, 23.
539	Basilides	(*Or.*),	*Novellae Just.*, 85; *Chronicon Paschale, anni* 532, ποιῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ μαγίστρου Ἑρμογένους ἐν Κωνσταντίνου πόλει.
539 to 565	Petrus	(*Or.*),	Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, 16; *De bello Gothico*, 4, 11; *De Caer.*, I, 84, rubric; *Novellae Just.*, 123, 546 A.D.; 137, 565 A.D.
565	Anastasius	(*Or.*),	Corippus, *Panegyr. in laudem Justini*, II, *pr.* 30.
579	Theodorus	(*Or.*),	Theophylactus, 3, 25. Menander Protector, *F.H.G.*, vol. IV, p. 257, fr. 55.
588	id.	(*Or.*),	*Historiens des Gaules et de la France* (Boquet), vol. IV, p. 85.
626	Bonus	(*Or.*),	*Chronicon Paschale.*
VI–VII Century	Isaac	(*Or.*),	Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'Empire byzantin*, p. 563.

II. MASTERS OF THE OFFICES IN THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

Leo III (717–740),	
Nicetas Xylinites, Master,	Theophanes, p. 400.
Constantine V (740–775),	
Theophanes,	Theophanes, p. 415.
Petros,	Theophanes, p. 442.
Leo IV (775–779),	
Petros,	Theophanes, p. 456.
Constantine VI (779–797),	
Petros,	Theophanes, p. 464.
Michael Lachanodrakon,	Theophanes, p. 468.
VIII–IX Centuries,	
Johannes,	Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, p. 563.
Nicephorus I (802–811),	
Theoktistos,	Theodore of Studion, *Epistulae*, 1, 24.
Stauricius (811),	
Theoktistos,	Theophanes, p. 492.
Michael I (811–813),	
Theoktistos,	Theophanes, p. 500.
Michael II (820–829),	
Christophoros,	Genesius, p. 35.
Stephanos,	Theodore of Studion, *Epist.*, 2, 76.
Irenaios,	Ps. Simeon, 622.

Digitized by Google

Theophilus (829–842),	
Alexios Musele,	Theophanes Continuatus, p. 108.
Manuel Armenios,	Genesius, p. 73; Theophanes Cont., p. 148.
Theophilus-Michael III (842–867),	
Arsaber, Stephanos, Bardas,	Theophanes Cont., p. 175.
Manuel Armenios,	Genesius, p. 83.
Basil,	Theophanes Cont., p. 238; Genesius, p. 111.
Petronas,	Genesius, p. 97.
Theodatakes,	Nicetas, *Vita Ignatii*, in Mansi, vol. XVI, p. 237.
Basil I (867–886),	
Manuel,	Theophanes Cont., p. 307.
Theodoros,	Mansi, vol. XVI, p. 309.
Leo VI (886–912),	
Stephanos,	Theophanes Cont., p. 354.
Stylianos,	Theophanes Cont., p. 354.
Katakalon,	Theophanes Cont., p. 359; *De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 45, p. 199.
Theodatakes,	Theophanes Cont., p. 361.
Stylianos,	*Vita Euthymii*, 3.
	Novellae Leonis VI, 1 and 18.
	Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, p. 553.
Erikorikios,	*De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 43, p. 185.
Aspasakios,	*De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 44, pp. 191, 193.
Constantine VII (912–958),	
Stephanos, Johannes Eladas, Leo Phokas,	Theophanes Cont., pp. 380, 381, 385, 388, 390.
Nicetas,	Theophanes Cont., pp. 413, 417.
Bardas Phokas,	Theophanes Cont., pp. 436, 459.
Johannes Kurkuas,	Theophanes Cont., p. 443; *De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 45, pp. 200, 204.
Kosmas, Romanos Saronites, Romanos Mousele,	Theophanes Cont., p. 443.
Pankratios,	*De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 45, p. 204.
Kurkenios,	*De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 46, pp. 206–208, 210–213.
Pankratios II,	*De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 46, p. 207.
Adranse,	*De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 46, p. 207.
Georgios,	*De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 46, p. 206.
David,	*De Administrando Imperio*, ch. 46, pp. 212, 213.

Digitized by Google

Basil II (963–1025),	
Nicephoros Uranos,	Cedrenus, II, p. 454.
Prusianos,	Cedrenus, II, p. 468, 469, 483.
Gregorios,	Cedrenus, II, p. 478.
Michael,	Cedrenus, II, p. 481.
Romanus III (1028–1034),	
Prusianos,	Cedrenus, II, p. 487.
Romanos Skleros,	Cedrenus, II, p. 487.
Michael,	Cedrenus, II, p. 488.
Basiliskos,	Cedrenus, II, pp. 501, 502.
Demetrios,	Cedrenus, II, pp. 503.
Michael IV (1034–1042),	
Apolaphar,	Cedrenus, II, p. 514.
Georgios Maniakes,	Cedrenus, II, pp. 541, 545.
Skleros,	Cedrenus, II, p. 547.
Constantine IX (1042–1055),	
Basileios Theodoreanos,	Cedrenus, II, p. 553.
Jobanesices,	Cedrenus, II, p. 557.
Karikios,	Cedrenus, II, p. 559.
Michael,	Cedrenus, II, p. 565
Constantinos Arianites,	Cedrenus, II, pp. 596, 597, 601.
Isaac Komnenos,	Cedrenus, II, p. 615.
Katakalon Kekaumenos,	Cedrenus, II, p. 615.
Theodora (1055–1057),	
Isaac Komnenos,	Cedrenus, II, p. 620.
Aaron Ducas,	Cedrenus, II, p. 628.
Michael,	Cedrenus, II, p. 634.
Constantine X (1059–1067),	
Basileios Apolaphos,	Johannes Scylitza, p. 654.
Nicephoros Botaniates,	Johannes Scylitza, p. 654.
Michael VII (1067–1078),	
Nicephoros Briennios,	Johannes Scylitza, pp. 693, 694.
Eutathios,	Johannes Scylitza, p. 701.
Alexios I (1081–1118),	
Unnamed Magistros,	Anna Comnena, p. 95.
XI–XII Centuries,	
Christophoros,	Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, p. 463, no. 1.
Maria (*magistrissa*),	Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, p. 532, nos. 8 and 9.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INDEX

A

adiutor, of *magister officiorum*, pp. 70, 71, 100 ff.
adiutores, of Quaestor, pp. 40, 83.
ἀδμησουνάλιος, see *comes admissionum*.
Administration, after Constantine I, p. 17;
  in Byzantine Empire, p. 50.
admissionales (*officium admissionum*), pp. 28, 35, 51, 66, 92 ff.
Adranse, of Iberia, Master, p. 57.
advocati, p. 22.
Aemilianus, *mag. off.*, pp. 82, 108.
agentes in rebus, pp. 22, 32, 34, 35, 38, 40, 59, 68 ff., 90, 100 ff.
ἀγγαλιαφόροι, *agentes in rebus*, p. 72.
Alemanni, p. 35.
Alexius I, Comnenus, Augustus (1081–1118), p. 58.
Ampelius, *mag. off.*, p. 117.
amplitudo tua, p. 115.
Anastasius, Augustus (491–518), pp. 97, 99.
Anastasius, *mag. off.*, p. 108.
Anatolius, *mag. off.*, pp. 34, 92, 106.
Anthemius, Augustus (467–472), pp. 39, 40, 43, 46, 64, 87.
Anthemius, *mag. off.*, p. 108.
ἀνθύπατοι, see Proconsuls.
ἀντιγραφεῖς, *magistri scriniorum*, pp. 83, 86.
Apasacios, of Apachume, Master, p. 57.
ἀποκόμβιον, purse, p. 123.
Apothecarius, p. 124.
apparitores, of *duces*, pp. 40, 41, 91.
Arcadius, Augustus (395–408), pp. 36, 37.
ἄρχοντες τοῦ Λαυσιακοῦ, pp. 118, 124.
Armenia, princes of, p. 57.
Arsenals, see *fabricae*, *fabricenses*.
Athanasius, bishop, p. 92.
ἀτριπλίνης, pp. 123, 124.
Attila, King of Huns, p. 93.
auctoritas, *tua*, p. 115.
ἀξία, of mastership, p. 119.
ἀξίαι, αἱ διὰ βραβείων, pp. 118, 120.

B

βαλτίδιον, p. 119.
barbaricarii, pp. 89, 102 ff.
Basil I, Augustus (867–886), pp. 55, 97.
βῆλον, see *velum*.
Bouché-Leclercq, author, on Mastership of Offices, p. 106.
βραβεῖον, p. 120.
Bury, J. B., author, on Byzantine Masters, pp. 52 ff.;
  on μάγιστρος ἐκ προσώπου, p. 53.

C

Caesar, title of rank, p. 56;
  conferment of, p. 100.
Caesaropapism, p. 117.
cancellarii, pp. 37, 38.
candidati, pp. 95, 97, 99.
cartularii or *chartularii*:
  of *sacrum cubiculum*, p. 111;
  of *scrinium barbarorum*, pp. 95, 103;
  of *scrinium fabricensium*, pp. 88, 102.
Cassiodorus, on ceremonial duties of Master of Offices, p. 92;
  career of, pp. 106 ff.
castrensiani, p. 64.
Castrensis, pp. 22, 27, 40.
Celer, *mag. off.*, pp. 96, 97, 99.
celsitudo tua, p. 115.
centenarii, of *agentes in rebus*, p. 71.
Ceremonies, of Byzantine court, pp. 118 ff.
Chamberlain, Grand, see *praepositus sacri cubiculi*.
Christophoros, Master, p. 58.
cingulum, of *mag. off.*, pp. 112 f.
Clarissimate, p. 45.
Clarissimus, pp. 20, 46, 101, 116;
  et illustris, p. 46;
  clarissimi comites, p. 62.
codicilli, p. 42.
comes admissionum, pp. 66, 67, 99;
  see also *magister admissionum*.
comes consistorianus, p. 91;
  comites consistoriani, pp. 44, 45, 46, 107.
comes dispositionum, pp. 22, 51, 67;
  see *mag. dispositionum*.
comes domesticorum, p. 22;
  comes d. equitum, p. 29;
  comes d. peditum, p. 29.

Digitized by Google

comes et magister equitum, p. 29;
et mag. off., pp. 29, 44, 116;
et mag. peditum, p. 29;
et quaestor, p. 29.
comes primi ordinis, p. 44.
comes rei militaris, p. 21.
comes rei privatae, pp. 21, 27, 29, 31, 41, 45, 46, 47, 63, 95.
comes sacrarum largitionum, pp. 21, 27, 29, 31, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 63, 94, 107.
comites, pp. 21, 29, 31, 62;
of *scholae palatinae*, pp. 63, 103.
comitiaci, in Ostrogothic Italy, p. 73.
comitiva, pp. 20, 44, 110.
Comnenoi, dynasty of, p. 58.
consistorium, pp. 21 ff., 25, 38, 90, 98 ff., 120.
Consistory, see *consistorium*.
Constans, Augustus (337–350), pp. 33, 34, 35, 92.
Constantine I, Augustus (306–337), pp. 17, 20, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 37, 44, 45, 60, 68, 74, 77, 80, 81, 82, 87.
Constantine IV, Augustus (668–685), p. 50.
Constantine V, Augustus (740–775), p. 52.
Constantine VII, Augustus (912–958), pp. 2, 96, 93, 123 ff.
Constantine VIII, Augustus (1025–1028), p. 58.
Constantine IX, Monomachus, Augustus (1042–1055), p. 57.
Constantius, Augustus (337–361), pp. 33, 34, 96.
consuetudo, p. 111;
consuetudines, p. 123.
Consulate, p. 107.
Corippus, poet, on embassy of Avars, p. 93;
on audience in the palace, p. 98.
Count, of the Body Guard, see *comes domesticorum*;
of the Privy Purse, see *comes rei privatae*;
of the Sacred Largesses, see *comes sacrarum largitionum*.
cubicularii, pp. 27, 40, 63, 64.
culmen tuum, p. 115.
curagendarii, p. 74.
Curcenios, of Iberia, Master, p. 57.
curiosi, *cursus publici*, pp. 34, 35, 74 ff., 101, 104;
litorum, p. 75.
curiosus cursus publici praesentalis, pp. 100, 104;
in praesenti, pp. 101, 104.
Curopalates, pp. 56, 125.
cursus publicus, pp. 32, 34 ff., 74 ff.

D

decani, pp. 37, 39, 40, 66, 120.
deputati, of *agentes in rebus*, pp. 71 ff.
dignitates, p. 20;
palatinae, pp. 22, 23, 44.
Diocletian, Augustus (284–305), pp. 1, 18, 25, 86, 89.
domestici, in general, p. 105;
of *comites scholarum*, p. 103.
domestici, imperial guards, p. 120;
see also *comes domesticorum*.
domesticus, of palace guards, pp. 50, 51, 56, 63, 102, 105;
of *mag. off.*, pp. 51, 63, 102, 104–105;
δομεστικὸς τῶν σχολῶν, see *domesticus* of palace guards.
ducenarii, of *agentes in rebus*, pp. 71 ff.
dux, p. 21;
duces, pp. 38, 40, 41, 42, 89 ff.

E

Embassies:
from Emperor in the West, pp. 93 f.;
from Gothic kings, p. 94;
from Persian king, pp. 94 f.
eminentia tua, p. 115.
Eugenes, *mag. off.*, p. 108.
Eugenius, Flavius, *mag. off.*, pp. 25, 35, 106, 107, 108.
Euphemius, *mag. off.*, p. 96.
Euphrasius, *mag. off.*, p. 34.
evectiones, pp. 35, 74 ff.
excellentissimus, pp. 46, 114.
excelsus, *vir*, p. 114.
excubitores, p. 97.

F

fabricae, pp. 32, 86 ff., 102, 103, 111.
fabricenses, pp. 82, 86 ff.;
see also *fabricae*.
Felix, *mag. off.*, pp. 34, 40, 106.
Florentius, *mag. off.*, pp. 96, 108.
formula, *magisteriae dignitatis*, p. 111.
frater amantissime, p. 114.
frumentarii, pp. 68, 78.

G

Galerius, Augustus (305–311), p. 32.
Gallus, Caesar (3551–3554), pp. 33, 34.
George, of Abasgia, Master, p. 57.
gloria tua, p. 115.
gloriosi, p. 20.
gloriosissimus, *-i*, pp. 46, 47, 117, 119.
Gratian, Augustus (367–383), p. 45.
Greek titles, in Byzantine Empire, pp. 49 ff.
Gregory, of Taran, Master, p. 57.

H

Hadrianus, *mag. off.*, pp. 107, 108.
Heraclianus, *tribunus et mag. off.*, p. 24.

Digitized by Google

Heraclius, Augustus (610–641), pp. 49, 105.
Hermogenes, *mag. off.*, pp. 96, 97, 107.
Hodgkin, author, on *mag. off.*, p. 106.
honorarii, illustres, pp. 42, 113.
hospitalitas, p. 81.
hospitium, p. 81.

I

illustris, pp. 20, 40, 42, 46, 81, 112 ff.;
illustris vir, pp. 116, 117;
et magnificus, p. 46;
honorarii, pp. 97, 113;
honorati, p. 112;
in actu positi, p. 112;
vacantes, p. 113.
Interpreters, pp. 36, 101;
interpretes diversarum gentium, p. 96.
iudicium, ducianum, p. 42.

J

Jobanesices, of Anium, Master, p. 57.
Julian, Augustus (361–363), pp. 34, 69, 77, 92, 96.
Justinian, Augustus (527–565), pp. 40, 43, 44, 48, 49, 78, 80, 81, 88, 90, 91, 96, 97, 99, 117.
Justinus I, Augustus (518–527), pp. 40, 43, 83, 97, 99.
Justinus II, Augustus (565–578), p. 48.

K

καμπάγιον, pp. 118 f.;
οἱ ὑπὸ καμπαγίον, id.
Karikios, Master, p. 57.
Karlowa, author, on origin of Mastership of Offices, p. 26.
kletorologion, 'invitation list,' p. 123;
of Philotheos, p. 124.
κόμης δδμηνσιόνων, see *comes admissionum*.

L

λαβαρήσιοι, p. 95.
lampadarii, pp. 38, 66.
Largesses, Sacred, see Count of.
laterculum, minus, pp. 85, 89.
Leo I, Augustus (457–474), pp. 39, 40, 61, 64, 87, 88, 97, 99, 102, 103.
Leo II, Augustus (474), pp. 40, 97, 99.
Leo III, the Isaurian, Augustus (717–740), p. 50.
Leo VI, Augustus (886–912), pp. 52, 55, 123, 124.
Leo, *mag. off.*, p. 106.
liber mandatorum, pp. 111, 121.
Licinius, Augustus (310–324), pp. 32, 33.
limitanei, pp. 41, 89 ff.
limites, pp. 38, 89 ff.
Logothete, of the Post, pp. 50, 51, 80, 98.
loroi, a decoration, p. 56;
use and significance of, p. 121.
λῶροι, see loroi.
ludimagistri, p. 8.
Luitprand, author, on the number of Masters, p. 56.
Lydus, Johannes, author, on decline of Pretorian Prefecture, pp. 30, 36, 37, 87;
on character of Mastership of Offices, pp. 105, 106;
on *curiosi*, p. 74;
on *evectiones*, pp. 78, 79;
on *regendarius*, p. 79.

M

Macedonius, *mag. off.*, p. 107.
magister, 'Master,' meaning and use of, pp. 5, 6.
magister admissionum, see Master of the Audiences.
magister dispositionum, see Master for the Schedules.
magister epistularum graecarum, see Master of Correspondence.
magister epistularum latinarum, see Master of Correspondence.
magister libellorum, see Master for Petitions.
magister memoriae, see Master of the Memoria.
magister militum, see Masters of the Soldiers.
magister officiorum, see Master of the Offices.
magisteriani, p. 73.
magistri, see Masters.
μαγιστριανοί, p. 73.
μαγίστρισσαι, wives of Byzantine Masters, pp. 125, 126.
μάγιστρος, see *magister*, Master.
μάγιστρος, ἐκ προσώπου, p. 53.
μάγιστρος, ὁ, see Master of the Offices.
μάγιστρος, ὁ πρῶτος, pp. 52 ff., 100.
Magnentius, Augustus (350–353), p. 33.
magnificentia tua, p. 115.
magnificentissimus, see *magnificus*.
magnificus, pp. 46, 117.
magnitudo tua, p. 115.
mandata, magistri, p. 111.
Marcellinus, *mag. off.*, p. 33.
Marcian, Augustus (450–457).
Maria, *magistrissa*, p. 58.
Martinalius, *mag. off.*, p. 93.
Martinianus, *mag. off.*, p. 24.
Master, title at Byzantine court, pp. 52, 53;
conferred for life, p. 53;
title in imperial civil service, pp. 14, 15.
Master of the Audiences, pp. 13, 14, 66, 67, 92, 95, 103.

Digitized by Google

Master of Ceremonies, pp. 51, 67, 99, 100, 120, 122, 123.
Master (Secretary) of Correspondence, pp. 14, 22, 51, 84.
Master of the Memoria (First Secretary), pp. 14, 22, 26, 27, 51, 84.
Master of the Offices:
adiutor of, pp. 70, 71, 100 ff.;
authority of, over:
admissionales, pp. 28, 35, 51, 66;
agentes in rebus, pp. 32, 38, 40, 59, 66, 68 ff.;
apparitores ducum, pp. 40, 41;
cancellarii, pp. 37, 38, 66;
castrensiani, p. 64;
cohortes praetorianae, p. 25;
cubicularii, pp. 40, 64;
cursus publicus, pp. 32, 34, 35, 43, 51, 74 ff.;
decani, pp. 37, 39, 66;
duces limitum, pp. 40, 41, 89 ff.;
fabricae and *fabricenses*, pp. 32, 40, 43, 86 ff.;
illustres (*viri*), p. 40;
lampadarii, pp. 28, 38, 66;
limites and *limitanei*, pp. 38, 41, 89 ff.;
mensores, pp. 28, 38, 80 ff.;
militares (*viri*), p. 41;
ministeriani, pp. 40, 41, 64;
notarii, p. 65;
officia palatina, pp. 39, 59, 63 ff., 68;
officiales, pp. 38, 40, 41, 59, 64;
palatini, pp. 40, 41;
peraequatores victualium, p. 43;
praepositi castrorum, pp. 40, 41;
referendarii, p. 65;
schola sacrae vestis, pp. 46, 64;
scholae and Scholarians, pp. 28, 51, 60 ff.;
scrinia and *scriniarii*, pp. 28, 40, 51, 59, 66, 82 ff.;
scrinium dispositionum, p. 67;
silentiarii, pp. 40, 65;
State Post, see *cursus publicus*;
stratores, pp. 39, 65;
in Byzantine Empire, pp. 49 ff.;
character of office, pp. 59, 105 ff.;
competence of, pp. 59 ff.;
cursus honorum of, pp. 106 ff.;
establishment of, p. 25;
functions of:
ceremonial duties, pp. 35, 51, 52, 92 ff., 98 ff.;
in *consistorium*, pp. 22, 31, 38, 44, 91 ff.;
judicial, pp. 38 ff., 68;
Greek title of, pp. 49, 50;
historical significance of, p. 1;
history of, pp. 24 ff.;
insignia of, pp. 110 ff.;
functions of — *continued*:
military origin of, p. 60;
as Minister for Foreign Affairs, pp. 35, 36;
number of, pp. 33, 34;
officium of, pp. 72, 100 ff.;
in Ostrogothic Kingdom, pp. 42, 43, 62;
rank of, pp. 44 ff.;
clarissimus, pp. 45, 113, 114, 116;
clarissimus et illustris, p. 46;
comes, pp. 29, 30, 44, 60;
comes consistorianus, pp. 44, 45;
excellentissimus, pp. 46, 114;
gloriosus, pp. 46, 47;
has honors of ex-Pretorian Prefects, p. 45;
illustris, pp. 45, 112 ff., 116 ff.;
magnificus, pp. 46, 117;
one of *dignitates palatinae*, pp. 23, 44;
masters of the soldiers, pp. 46, 48;
perfectissimus, p. 45;
precedes Proconsuls, p. 45;
a senator, p. 48;
spectabilis, pp. 45, 113, 114, 116;
tribunus, pp. 24 ff., 60;
relation of, to:
castrensis, pp. 40, 41;
comes (*magister*) *admissionum*, p. 67;
comes dispositionum, p. 67;
comes rei privatae, pp. 41, 46, 47;
comes sacrarum largitionum, pp. 41, 46, 47;
praepositus sacri cubiculi, pp. 35, 40, 41, 47, 48;
Pretorian Prefect, pp. 29, 30, 31, 34, 35 ff., 42, 43, 46 ff., 78 ff., 108;
Quaestor, pp. 42, 46 ff., 83 ff., 91, 108;
Urban Prefect, pp. 42, 43;
sources for study of, p. 2;
term of, p. 109;
titles, honors, and privileges of, pp. 110 ff.; see also rank of;
vices agens of, p. 43.
Master (Secretary) for Petitions, pp. 14, 22, 26, 27, 51, 85.
Master (Secretary) for the Schedules, pp. 14, 22, 26.
Masters:
chiefs of secretarial bureaus, pp. 13 ff.;
in civil service, pp. 13 ff.;
in commercial and social organizations, pp. 7, 8;
in financial administration, p. 13;
in military service, pp. 15 ff.;
magistrates of the Republic, p. 7;
primarily religious, pp. 8 ff.
Masters, Byzantine:
ceremonies at appointment of, pp. 119 ff.;
constitute first *velum*, p. 125;

Digitized by Google

Masters, Byzantine — *continued:*
disappearance of, p. 58;
donations received by, pp. 123, 124;
dress and insignia of, pp. 120 ff.;
functions of, pp. 54, 55;
gratuities dispensed by, pp. 122, 123;
honors and privileges of, pp. 117 ff.;
later purely honorary, pp. 56, 58;
number:
in VIII Cent., pp. 52, 53;
in IX Cent., p. 55;
in X Cent., p. 56;
order of rank and position among dignitaries of court, pp. 55, 56, 118, 125;
vassal princes as, p. 57.
Masters, of the Scrinia, pp. 13, 14, 15, 28, 83 ff.
Masters, of the Soldiers, *magistri militum*, pp. 16, 21, 30, 41, 42, 46, 47, 50, 90, 91;
in the Presence, *praesentales*, pp. 42, 85, 90.
Masters, 'of the state,' p. 98.
mensores, pp. 80 ff.
metata, pp. 81 ff.
metatores, pp. 81 ff.
Michael III, Augustus (842–867), pp. 54, 55.
Michael VI, Augustus (1056–1057), p. 58.
ministeriani, p. 40.
Mommsen, author:
on Master and Quaestor, p. 48;
on origin of Mastership of Offices, p. 25;
on use of *magister* and *magistratus*, p. 6;

N

Nobelissimus, pp. 56, 125.
Nomus, *mag. off.*, p. 107.
notarii (*tribuni*), pp. 65, 107.
Notitia Dignitatum, compilation of, p. 65.
date of, p. 2.
numeri, *praesentales*, p. 42.

O

ὁ διέπων, see Viceroy.
ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως, see Master of Ceremonies.
ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων, see Master for Petitions.
officia (*palatina*), pp. 26, 30, 37, 59, 64.
officiales, pp. 22, 27, 40, 41, 59;
palatini, p. 64;
officium, pp. 22, 28, 101;
adiutoris, p. 101;
admissionum, p. 28;
of *mag. off.*, pp. 100 ff.
Opilio, *mag. off.*, p. 107.
Orders, of rank, pp. 20, 56.

P

Palace Guards, see *scholae*.
Paleologi, dynasty of, p. 58.
Palladius (1), *mag. off.*, p. 25;
first *comes et mag.*, p. 32;
(2) *mag. off.*, p. 107.
Pancratios (1), of Iberia, Master, p. 57.
(2) grandson of (1), Master, p. 57.
Patricians, p. 55;
creation of, p. 54;
elevation to Mastership, pp. 119, 120;
wearers of loroi, pp. 121 ff.
Patriciate, pp. 20, 48.
πατρίκια, p. 125;
π. ζῶσται, p. 125.
pectorals, p. 122.
Pentadius, *mag. off.*, pp. 34, 96.
peraequatores victualium, p. 43.
Perfectissimate, p. 45.
Peter, the Patrician, work on Mastership of Offices, p. 25;
see Petrus (1).
Petrus, (1) = Peter the Patrician, *mag. off.*, pp. 96, 107, 108.
(2) *mag. off.*, p. 96.
Philotheos, *atriklines*, p. 124.
Phokas, Bardas, Master, p. 56.
Phokas, Leo, p. 56.
praefecti annonae, p. 43;
p. castrorum, p. 85;
p. vehiculorum, p. 74.
praepositi castrorum, pp. 40, 41, 85;
p. fabricarum, pp. 32, 86, 89.
praepositus sacri cubiculi, pp. 22, 27, 40, 41, 46, 47, 54, 55, 63, 64, 97, 99, 100, 119, 120, 122, 123.
praetorianae cohortes, pp. 26, 27.
Prefect, Pretorian, pp. 29, 30, 46, 47, 48, 50, 74 ff., 86, 108;
of the Orient, p. 37.
Prefect, Urban, pp. 54, 77, 95, 97, 108.
Prefecture, Pretorian, defined, p. 29;
weakened, pp. 30, 36, 37;
abolished, p. 50.
Pretorians, see *praetorianae cohortes*.
primicerius, rank of, p. 62;
p. notariorum, p. 111;
p. sacri cubiculi, p. 22.
principes, *agentes in rebus*, heads of *officia*, pp. 72, 79.
princeps, of *agentes in rebus*, p. 69.
Priscus, author, on *mag. off.*, p. 93.
probatoria, pp. 62, 85.
Proconsuls, (1) provincial governors, p. 45.
(2) Byzantine order of rank, pp. 55, 121 ff.
Proculianus, *tribunus et mag. off.*, p. 25.
προελευσιμαῖοι, οἱ, p. 118.
Prusianos, a Bulgar, Master, p. 57.

Digitized by Google

Q

Quaestor:
quaestor sacri palatii, pp. 21, 25, 28, 29, 31, 40, 42, 45 ff., 50, 51, 83 ff., 91, 108;
comes et quaestor, p. 29.

R

referendarii, p. 65.
regendarius, p. 79.
Remigius, *mag. off.*, p. 107.
Romaioi, p. 49.
Romanos, Mousele, Master, p. 56.
Romanos, Saronites, Master, p. 56.
Romanus, Augustus (919–945), p. 57.
Rombaud, author, on Byzantine court dignities, p. 57.
Rufinus, *mag. off.*, *pp. Orientis*, pp. 36, 37, 78, 87, 107, 108.

S

Saccellarius, p. 95.
σαγίον, ἀληθινόν, p. 120.
saiones, Ostrogothic, pp. 73, 76.
Schiller, author, on Mastership of Offices, pp. 26, 106.
schola, of *agentes in rebus*, see *agentes;*
schola sacrae vestis, pp. 40, 64.
scholae, *palatinae*, pp. 32, 40, 51, 60 ff., 97, 111;
scholae scutariorum et gentilium, pp. 23, 27, 102, 120.
Scholarians, see *scholae*.
scrinia, pp. 26, 82 ff.
scriniarii, pp. 40, 59, 82 ff.
scrinium fabricarum (*fabricensium*), pp. 82, 102.
scrinium barbarorum, pp. 94, 95, 102 ff.
scrinium epistularum, p. 96.
scrinium libellorum, p. 97.
Secret Service, see *agentes in rebus*.
Secretary, First, see Master of the Memoria;
for Correspondence, see Master of the Correspondence;
for Petitions, see Master of Petitions;
for the Schedules, see Master for the Schedules.
Seeck, O, author:
on *comites* of Constantine I, p. 29;
on *comitiaci*, p. 73;
on Master and Quaestor, p. 48;
on origin of Mastership of Offices, p. 26.
σέκρετον, pp. 52, 53, 119, 126.
Serrigny, author, on Mastership of Offices, p. 106.
Siburius, *mag. off.*, p. 108.
silentiarii, pp. 27, 40.
sinceritas tua, p. 116.
spatharius, p. 95.
spectabilis, *vir*, p. 116.
sportula, p. 111.
State Post, see *cursus publicus;*
overseers of, pp. 34 ff., 68.
στέψιμον, coronation anniversary, pp. 123, 124.
Steward of the Household, see Castrensis.
στιχάριον, p. 119.
Strategoi, p. 56.
stratores, pp. 39, 65, 73.
Stylianos, *mag. off.*, pp. 52, 55.
subadiuvae, *adiutoris*, pp. 71, 95, 100, 101, 102;
subadiuvae barbaricariorum, pp. 89, 100, 102;
subadiuvae fabricarum, pp. 88, 100 ff.
sublimissimus, p. 114.
sublimitas tua, p. 116.
συγκλητικοί, p. 118.
συνήθεια, gratuity, pp. 122 ff.
Syagrius, *mag. off.*, pp. 107, 108.

T

Taran, princes of, p. 57.
Themes, p. 50.
Theoderic, Gothic king, pp. 42, 43, 76, 78.
Theodorus, *mag. off.*, p. 97.
Theodosius I, Augustus (383–395), p. 45.
Theodosius II, Augustus (408–450), pp. 36, 41, 90, 92, 93, 103.
Theodotus, *mag. off.*, p. 108.
Theophanes, μάγιστρος ἐκ προσώπου, p. 53.
Theophilus, Augustus (829–842), p. 97.
θωράκια, 'pectorals,' p. 122.
τιμή, of Mastership, p. 119.
Trebonianus, *quaestor*, *mag off.*, p. 108.
Tribuni, clerks, p. 22;
commanders of *scholae palatinae*, pp. 27, 63;
tribuni fabricarum, p. 89;
tribuni notarii, pp. 22, 65;
tribunus, *et mag. off.*, pp. 24 ff., 60.

U

ὑπεροχή, ἡ σή, see *celsitudo*, *culmen*, *sublimitas*.
Ursatius, *mag. off.*, pp. 34, 93.

V

Valens, Augustus (364–378), pp. 41, 46, 89.
Valentinian I, Augustus (364–375), pp. 34, 105.
Valentinian III, Augustus (425–455), pp. 41, 46, 66.
velum, pp. 52, 125.
vicarii, of dioceses, p. 21;
subordinate officers, pp. 97, 101.
vicarius a consiliis sacris, p. 26.
Vicars, of dioceses, see *vicarii*.
Viceroy, p. 97.
Vincomalus, *mag. off.*, p. 107.

Z

Zeno, the Isaurian, Augustus (474–491), pp. 39, 46, 61, 64, 65.
Zoste Patricia, p. 56.

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Studies

HUMANISTIC SERIES

General Editors: FRANCIS W. KELSEY and HENRY A. SANDERS

Size, 22.7 × 15.2 cm. 8°. Bound in cloth

VOL. I. ROMAN HISTORICAL SOURCES AND INSTITUTIONS. Edited by Professor Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan. Pp. viii + 402. $2.50 net.

CONTENTS

1. THE MYTH ABOUT TARPEIA: Professor Henry A. Sanders.
2. THE MOVEMENTS OF THE CHORUS CHANTING THE CARMEN SAECULARE: Professor Walter Dennison, Swarthmore College.
3. STUDIES IN THE LIVES OF ROMAN EMPRESSES, JULIA MAMAEA: Professor Mary Gilmore Williams, Mt. Holyoke College.
4. THE ATTITUDE OF DIO CASSIUS TOWARD EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES: Professor Duane Reed Stuart, Princeton University.
5. THE LOST EPITOME OF LIVY: Professor Henry A. Sanders.
6. THE PRINCIPALES OF THE EARLY EMPIRE: Professor Joseph H. Drake, University of Michigan.
7. CENTURIONS AS SUBSTITUTE COMMANDERS OF AUXILIARY CORPS: Professor George H. Allen, University of Cincinnati.

VOL. II. WORD FORMATION IN PROVENÇAL. By Professor Edward L. Adams, University of Michigan. Pp. xvii + 607. $4.00 net.

Vol. III. LATIN PHILOLOGY. Edited by Professor Clarence Linton Meader, University of Michigan. Pp. vii + 290. $2.00 net.

Parts Sold Separately in Paper Covers:

Part I. THE USE OF IDEM, IPSE, AND WORDS OF RELATED MEANING. By Clarence L. Meader. Pp. 1–111. $0.75.

Part II. A STUDY IN LATIN ABSTRACT SUBSTANTIVES. By Professor Manson A. Stewart, Yankton College. Pp. 113–78. $0.40.

Part III. THE USE OF THE ADJECTIVE AS A SUBSTANTIVE IN THE DE RERUM NATURA OF LUCRETIUS. By Dr. Frederick T. Swan. Pp. 179–214. $0.40.

Part IV. AUTOBIOGRAPHIC ELEMENTS IN LATIN INSCRIPTIONS. By Professor Henry H. Armstrong, Drury College. Pp. 215–86. $0.40.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Studies — *Continued*

VOL. IV. ROMAN HISTORY AND MYTHOLOGY. Edited by Professor Henry A. Sanders. Pp. viii + 427. $2.50 net.

Parts Sold Separately in Paper Covers:

Part I. STUDIES IN THE LIFE OF HELIOGABALUS. By Dr. Orma Fitch Butler, University of Michigan. Pp. 1–169. $1.25 net.

Part II. THE MYTH OF HERCULES AT ROME. By Professor John G. Winter, University of Michigan. Pp. 171–273. $0.50 net.

Part III. ROMAN LAW STUDIES IN LIVY. By Professor Alvin E. Evans, Washington State College. Pp. 275–354. $0.40 net.

Part IV. REMINISCENCES OF ENNIUS IN SILIUS ITALICUS. By Dr. Loura B. Woodruff. Pp. 355–424. $0.40 net.

VOL. V. SOURCES OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. By Rev. Dr. Carl S. Patton, First Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio. Pp. xiii + 263. $1.30 net.

Size, 28 × 18.5 cm. 4to.

VOL. VI. ATHENIAN LEKYTHOI WITH OUTLINE DRAWING IN GLAZE VARNISH ON A WHITE GROUND. By Arthur Fairbanks, Director of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. With 15 plates, and 57 illustrations in the text. Pp. viii + 371. Bound in cloth. $4.00 net.

VOL. VII. ATHENIAN LEKYTHOI WITH OUTLINE DRAWING IN MATT COLOR ON A WHITE GROUND, AND AN APPENDIX: ADDITIONAL LEKYTHOI WITH OUTLINE DRAWING IN GLAZE VARNISH ON A WHITE GROUND. By Arthur Fairbanks. With 41 plates. Pp. x + 275. Bound in cloth. $3.50 net.

VOL. VIII. THE OLD TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. By Professor Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan. With 9 plates showing pages of the Manuscripts in facsimile. Pp. viii + 357. Bound in cloth. $3.50 net.

Parts Sold Separately in Paper Covers:

Part I. THE WASHINGTON MANUSCRIPT OF DEUTERONOMY AND JOSHUA. With 3 folding plates. Pp. vi + 104. $1.25.

Part II. THE WASHINGTON MANUSCRIPT OF THE PSALMS. With 1 single plate and 5 folding plates. Pp. viii + 105–357. $2.00 net.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64–66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Studies — *Continued*

VOL. IX. THE NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. By Professor Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan. With 8 plates showing pages of the Manuscripts in facsimile. Pp. ix + 337. Bound in cloth. $3.50 net.

Parts sold separately in Paper Covers:

Part I. THE WASHINGTON MANUSCRIPT OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. With 5 plates. Pp. vii + 247. $2.00 net.

Part II. THE WASHINGTON FRAGMENTS OF THE EPISTLES OF PAUL. With 3 plates. Pp. vii, 249–337. $1.25 net.

VOL. X. THE COPTIC MANUSCRIPTS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. By Professor William H. Worrell, Hartford Seminary Foundation.

Part I. A FRAGMENT OF A PSALTER IN THE SAHIDIC DIALECT. The Coptic Text, with an Introduction, and with 6 plates showing pages of the Manuscript and Fragments in facsimile. Pp. xxvi + 112. $2.00 net.

Part II. A HOMILY OF CELESTINUS ON THE ARCHANGEL GABRIEL AND A HOMILY OF THEOPHILUS ON ST. MARY THEOTOKOS, FROM MANUSCRIPT FRAGMENTS IN THE FREER COLLECTION AND THE BRITISH MUSEUM. The Coptic Text, with an Introduction and Translation, and with plates showing pages of the Manuscript in facsimile. (*In preparation.*)

VOL. XI. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE. (*Parts I and II ready.*)

Part I. ROBERT OF CHESTER'S LATIN TRANSLATION OF THE ALGEBRA OF AL-KHOWARIZMI. With an Introduction, Critical Notes, and an English Version. By Professor Louis C. Karpinski, University of Michigan. With 4 plates showing pages of manuscripts in facsimile, and 25 diagrams in the text. Pp. vii + 164. Paper covers. $2.00 net.

Part II. THE PRODROMUS OF NICOLAUS STENO'S LATIN DISSERTATION ON A SOLID BODY ENCLOSED BY PROCESS OF NATURE WITHIN A SOLID. Translated into English by Professor John G. Winter, University of Michigan, with a Foreword by Professor William H. Hobbs. With 7 plates. Pp. 165–283. Paper covers. $1.30 net.

Part III. VESUVIUS IN ANTIQUITY. Passages of Ancient Authors, with a Translation and Elucidations. By Francis W. Kelsey. Illustrated.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64–66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Studies — *Continued*

VOL. XII. STUDIES IN EAST CHRISTIAN AND ROMAN ART. By Professor Charles R. Morey, Princeton University, and Professor Walter Dennison, Swarthmore College. With 67 plates (10 colored) and 91 illustrations in the text. Pp. xii + 173. $4.75 net.

Parts sold separately:

Part I. EAST CHRISTIAN PAINTINGS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. By Professor Charles R. Morey. With 13 plates (10 colored) and 34 illustrations in the text. Pp. xii + 87. Bound in cloth. $2.50 net.

Part II. A GOLD TREASURE OF THE LATE ROMAN PERIOD FROM EGYPT. By Professor Walter Dennison. With 54 plates and 57 illustrations in the text. Pp. 89–173. Bound in cloth. $2.50 net.

VOL. XIII. DOCUMENTS FROM THE CAIRO GENIZAH IN THE FREER COLLECTION. Text, with Translation and an Introduction by Professor Richard Gottheil, Columbia University. (*In Preparation.*)

VOL. XIV. ASPECTS OF ROMAN LAW AND ADMINISTRATION.

Part I. THE MASTER OF OFFICES IN THE LATER ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EMPIRES. By Arthur E. R. Boak, University of Michigan. Pp. x + 160. Paper covers. $1.00 net.

SCIENTIFIC SERIES

Size, 28 × 18.5 cm. 4°. Bound in cloth

VOL. I. THE CIRCULATION AND SLEEP. By Professor John F. Shepard, University of Michigan. Pp. x + 83, with an Atlas of 83 plates, bound separately. Text and Atlas, $2.50 net.

VOL. II. STUDIES ON DIVERGENT SERIES AND SUMMABILITY. By Professor Walter B. Ford, University of Michigan. Pp. xi + 193. $2.50.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64–66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Publications

HUMANISTIC PUBLICATIONS

Size, 22.7 × 15.2 cm. 8°. Bound in cloth

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF GEORGE SYLVESTER MORRIS. A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN THOUGHT IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By R. M. Wenley, Litt.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan. Pp. xv + 332. $1.50 net.

"This book is from many points of view one of the most interesting . . . that has appeared for many a day. It is a tribute from one great philosophical teacher to another, his predecessor. . . . For its true scholarship and its loftiness of thought, as well as for its minuteness of research and exceeding carefulness of statement, the book must rank high among biographies." — Professor F. H. Foster, in *The Bibliotheca Sacra.*

"Dr. Wenley has given us a most interesting and instructive account of one of his predecessors in the Chair of Philosophy in the University of Michigan. . . . We owe a deep debt of gratitude for the great pains he has expended on what has obviously been a labour of love. The way in which he has traced the philosophical development of his predecessor is masterly." — Professor John Watson, in *The Queen's Quarterly.*

"A more exhaustive biography, and we may add a more appreciative one, has rarely been written. . . . One can only say that of all the good fortunes that could befall such a man, the greatest is to have so worthy, eminent, and loyal a biographer. . . . Indeed, it is so good that the name of Morris will always be associated with that of Wenley. The book ought to inspire others who have the now rather dwindling faculty of appreciation, to give us similar memoirs of James, Royce, Münsterberg, Charles Pierce, and perhaps we might add, William T. Harris." — President G. Stanley Hall, in *The American Journal of Psychology.*

"It is impossible to read the book — and it is very readable — without feeling that Professor Wenley is peculiarly fitted to be its author. It is not only the fine qualities of style and ripe knowledge of men — these one would expect from a writer of Professor Wenley's reputation — but the remarkable personal sympathy with every phase of spiritual experience through which Morris passes, which especially impresses the reader. Rare glimpses of the biographer's own personality reveal a kindred spirit, who not only appreciates, but is one with his subject, because he has himself passed through the fire. This personal penetration is dominant, and produces a living artistic unity rare in literature; so that the book is no mere biographical study, but a living drama, a true Odyssey of the spirit." — *The Dial*, Chicago.

"The highest praise that can be bestowed on a book like this is that it gives dignity and ideal value to the commonplaces of our university life, — making of the election of courses a sacrament and of the giving of lectures in dingy recitation rooms moments in the evolution of a significant *Weltanschauung.* Such a tribute may be honestly paid to Professor Wenley's narrative. It rises to the nobility of its subject. One reads it with a growing appreciation of Michigan's contribution to thought, and turns the last page reluctantly, feeling that through the biographer's art he has for a time come into intimate contact with one of the intellectual forces of the nineteenth century, — has seen the world of ideas take a forward step under the impulse of one of our own clan — a citizen of no mean city." — Professor F. N. Scott, in *The Michigan Alumnus.*

"Professor Wenley's admirable account has a value not only for the alumni of Michigan but for a wider circulation. . . . In the task of giving Morris his personal and intellectual setting the author has been remarkably successful in reproducing the spirit and motives of New England thought and life in the middle of the nineteenth century. . . . The author, the many former students of Professor Morris, the University of Michigan, and teachers of philosophy are to be congratulated upon Professor Wenley's painstaking research and sympathetic interpretation." — Professor J. H. Tufts, in *The International Journal of Ethics.*

"The work is a biography in the sense of an interpretation of a life, in relation to that larger intellectual life in which the personality of Professor Morris . . . functioned. None but perfect work might be expected from the author. The degree of success with which he has accomplished his task is reflected in the words of President G. Stanley Hall, of Clark University, who regards the book as the best biography ever written of any American thinker. . . . Unquestionably such work should be undertaken only by eminent men who have the large view so needful for the proper setting of a great life." — *Michigan History Magazine.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

Size, 22.7 × 15.2 cm. 8°. Bound in cloth

LATIN AND GREEK IN AMERICAN EDUCATION, WITH SYMPOSIA ON THE VALUE OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES. Edited by Francis W. Kelsey. Pp. x + 396. $1.50 net.

CONTENTS

THE PRESENT POSITION OF LATIN AND GREEK, THE VALUE OF LATIN AND GREEK AS EDUCATIONAL INSTRUMENTS, THE NATURE OF CULTURE STUDIES.

SYMPOSIA ON THE VALUE OF HUMANISTIC, PARTICULARLY CLASSICAL, STUDIES AS A PREPARATION FOR THE STUDY OF MEDICINE, ENGINEERING, LAW, AND THEOLOGY.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE VALUE OF HUMANISTIC, PARTICULARLY CLASSICAL, STUDIES AS A TRAINING FOR MEN OF AFFAIRS.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE CLASSICS AND THE NEW EDUCATION.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE DOCTRINE OF FORMAL DISCIPLINE IN THE LIGHT OF CONTEMPORARY PSYCHOLOGY.

Owing to the unanticipated demand for this volume it is now out of print. A new edition is in preparation.

THE MENAECHMI OF PLAUTUS. The Latin Text, with a Translation by Joseph H. Drake, University of Michigan. Pp. xi + 130. Paper covers. $0.60 net.

This edition of the Menaechmi was prepared, with stage directions, as a libretto for the presentation of the play at the University of Michigan in 1890. It was revised and republished in 1916.

Distributed by the University of Michigan

FACSIMILE OF THE WASHINGTON MANUSCRIPT OF DEUTERONOMY AND JOSHUA IN THE FREER COLLECTION. With an Introduction by Henry A. Sanders. Pp. x, 201 heliotype plates. Ann Arbor, Michigan, The University of Michigan, 1910.

Limited edition, distributed only to Libraries, under certain conditions. A list of Libraries containing this Facsimile is printed in *University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, Volume VIII, pp. 351–353.

FACSIMILE OF THE WASHINGTON MANUSCRIPT OF THE FOUR GOSPELS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. With an Introduction by Henry A. Sanders. Pp. x, 372 heliotype plates and 2 colored plates. Ann Arbor, Michigan, The University of Michigan, 1912.

Limited edition, distributed only to Libraries, under certain conditions. A list of Libraries containing this Facsimile is printed in *University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, Volume IX, pp. 317–320.

Digitized by Google

Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities

Edited by PERCY GARDNER and FRANCIS W. KELSEY

THE PRINCIPLES OF GREEK ART

By PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., Lincoln and Merton Professor of Classical Archaeology in the University of Oxford.

Makes clear the artistic and psychological principles underlying Greek art, especially sculpture, which is treated as a characteristic manifestation of the Greek spirit. a development parallel to that of Greek literature and religion. While there are many handbooks of Greek archaeology, this volume holds a unique place.

New Edition. Illustrated. Cloth, $2.50

GREEK ARCHITECTURE

By ALLAN MARQUAND, Ph.D., L.H.D., Professor of Art and Archaeology in Princeton University.

Professor Marquand, in this interesting and scholarly volume, passes from the materials of construction to the architectural forms and decorations of the buildings of Greece, and lastly, to its monuments. Nearly four hundred illustrations assist the reader in a clear understanding of the subject.

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.25

GREEK SCULPTURE

By ERNEST A. GARDNER, M.A., Professor of Archaeology in University College, London.

A comprehensive outline of our present knowledge of Greek sculpture, distinguishing the different schools and periods, and showing the development of each. This volume, fully illustrated, fills an important gap and is widely used as a text-book.

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.50

GREEK CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

By A. H. J GREENIDGE, M.A., Late Lecturer in Hertford College and Brasenose College, Oxford.

Most authors in writing of Greek History emphasize the structure of the constitutions; Mr. Greenidge lays particular stress upon the workings of these constitutions. With this purpose ever in view, he treats of the development of Greek public law, distinguishing the different types of states as they appear.

Cloth, $1.50

GREEK AND ROMAN COINS

By G. F. HILL, M. A., of the Department of Coins and Medals in the British Museum.

All the information needed by the beginner in numismatics, or for ordinary reference, is here presented. The condensation necessary to bring the material within the size of the present volume has in no way interfered with its clearness or readableness.

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.25

GREEK ATHLETIC SPORTS AND FESTIVALS

By E. NORMAN GARDINER, M.A., Sometime Classical Exhibitioner of Christ Church College, Oxford.

With more than two hundred illustrations from contemporary art, and bright descriptive text, this work proves of equal interest to the general reader and to the student of the past. Many of the problems with which it deals — the place of physical training, games, athletics, in daily and national life — are found to be as real at the present time as they were in the far-off days of Greece.

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.50

ON SALE WHEREVER BOOKS ARE SOLD

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities — *Continued*

ATHENS AND ITS MONUMENTS

By CHARLES HEALD WELLER, of the University of Iowa.

This book embodies the results of many years of study and of direct observation during different periods of residence in Athens. It presents in concise and readable form a description of the ancient city in the light of the most recent investigations. Profusely illustrated with Half-tones and Line Engravings.

Illustrated. Cloth, $4.00

THE DESTRUCTION OF ANCIENT ROME

By RODOLFO LANCIANI, D.C.L., Oxford; LL.D., Harvard; Professor of Ancient Topography in the University of Rome.

Rome, the fate of her buildings and masterpieces of art, is the subject of this profusely illustrated volume. Professor Lanciani gives us vivid pictures of the Eternal City at the close of the different periods of history.

Illustrated. Cloth, $1.50

ROMAN FESTIVALS

By W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A., Fellow and Sub-Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.

This book covers in a concise form almost all phases of the public worship of the Roman state, as well as certain ceremonies which, strictly speaking, lay outside that public worship. It will be found very useful to students of Roman literature and history as well as to students of anthropology and the history of religion.

Cloth, $1.50

ROMAN PUBLIC LIFE

By A. H. J. GREENIDGE, Late Lecturer in Hertford College and Brasenose College, Oxford.

The growth of the Roman constitution and its working during the developed Republic and the Principate is the subject which Mr. Greenidge here set for himself. All important aspects of public life, municipal and provincial, are treated so as to reveal the political genius of the Romans in connection with the chief problems of administration.

Cloth, $2.50

MONUMENTS OF THE EARLY CHURCH

By WALTER LOWRIE, M.A., Late Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Rome.

Nearly two hundred photographs and drawings of the most representative monumental remains of Christian antiquity, accompanied by detailed expositions, make this volume replete with interest for the general reader and at the same time useful as a hand-book for the student of Christian archaeology in all its branches.

Illustrated. Cloth, $1.50

MONUMENTS OF CHRISTIAN ROME

By ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Ph.D., Sometime Associate Director of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, and formerly Professor of Archaeology and Ancient History in Princeton University.

"The plan of the volume is simple and admirable. The first part comprises a historical sketch; the second, a classification of the monuments." — *The Outlook.*

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.25

ON SALE WHEREVER BOOKS ARE SOLD

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

3 2044 056 11

This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

DUE OCT 7 '40

4354175

WIDENER

NOV 1 8 2003

BOOK DUE

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Studies

HUMANISTIC SERIES

General Editors: FRANCIS W. KELSEY and HENRY A. SANDERS

Size, 22.7 × 15.2 cm. 8°. Bound in cloth

VOL. I. ROMAN HISTORICAL SOURCES AND INSTITUTIONS. Edited by Professor Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan. Pp. viii + 402. $2.50 net.

CONTENTS

1. THE MYTH ABOUT TARPEIA: Professor Henry A. Sanders.
2. THE MOVEMENTS OF THE CHORUS CHANTING THE CARMEN SAECULARE: Professor Walter Dennison, Swarthmore College.
3. STUDIES IN THE LIVES OF ROMAN EMPRESSES, JULIA MAMAEA: Professor Mary Gilmore Williams, Mt. Holyoke College.
4. THE ATTITUDE OF DIO CASSIUS TOWARD EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES: Professor Duane Reed Stuart, Princeton University.
5. THE LOST EPITOME OF LIVY: Professor Henry A. Sanders.
6. THE PRINCIPALES OF THE EARLY EMPIRE: Professor Joseph H. Drake, University of Michigan.
7. CENTURIONS AS SUBSTITUTE COMMANDERS OF AUXILIARY CORPS: Professor George H. Allen, University of Cincinnati.

VOL. II. WORD FORMATION IN PROVENÇAL. By Professor Edward L. Adams, University of Michigan. Pp. xvii + 607. $4.00 net.

Vol. III. LATIN PHILOLOGY. Edited by Professor Clarence Linton Meader, University of Michigan. Pp. vii + 290. $2.00 net.

Parts Sold Separately in Paper Covers:

Part I. THE USE OF IDEM, IPSE, AND WORDS OF RELATED MEANING. By Clarence L. Meader. Pp. 1–111. $0.75.

Part II. A STUDY IN LATIN ABSTRACT SUBSTANTIVES. By Professor Manson A. Stewart, Yankton College. Pp. 113–78. $0.40.

Part III. THE USE OF THE ADJECTIVE AS A SUBSTANTIVE IN THE DE RERUM NATURA OF LUCRETIUS. By Dr. Frederick T. Swan. Pp. 179–214. $0.40.

Part IV. AUTOBIOGRAPHIC ELEMENTS IN LATIN INSCRIPTIONS. By Professor Henry H. Armstrong, Drury College. Pp. 215–86. $0.40.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Studies — *Continued*

VOL. XII. STUDIES IN EAST CHRISTIAN AND ROMAN ART. By Professor Charles R. Morey, Princeton University, and Professor Walter Dennison, Swarthmore College. With 67 plates (10 colored) and 91 illustrations in the text. Pp. xii + 173. $4.75 net.

Parts sold separately:

Part I. EAST CHRISTIAN PAINTINGS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. By Professor Charles R. Morey. With 13 plates (10 colored) and 34 illustrations in the text. Pp. xii + 87. Bound in cloth. $2.50 net.

Part II. A GOLD TREASURE OF THE LATE ROMAN PERIOD FROM EGYPT. By Professor Walter Dennison. With 54 plates and 57 illustrations in the text. Pp. 89–173. Bound in cloth. $2.50 net.

VOL. XIII. DOCUMENTS FROM THE CAIRO GENIZAH IN THE FREER COLLECTION. Text, with Translation and an Introduction by Professor Richard Gottheil, Columbia University. (*In Preparation.*)

VOL. XIV. ASPECTS OF ROMAN LAW AND ADMINISTRATION.

Part I. THE MASTER OF OFFICES IN THE LATER ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EMPIRES. By Arthur E. R. Boak, University of Michigan. Pp. x + 160. Paper covers. $1.00 net.

SCIENTIFIC SERIES

Size, 28 × 18.5 cm. 4°. Bound in cloth

VOL. I. THE CIRCULATION AND SLEEP. By Professor John F. Shepard, University of Michigan. Pp. x+83, with an Atlas of 83 plates, bound separately. Text and Atlas, $2.50 net.

VOL. II. STUDIES ON DIVERGENT SERIES AND SUMMABILITY. By Professor Walter B. Ford, University of Michigan. Pp. xi+193. $2.50.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64–66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

University of Michigan Publications

HUMANISTIC PUBLICATIONS

Size, 22.7 × 15.2 cm. 8°. Bound in cloth

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF GEORGE SYLVESTER MORRIS. A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN THOUGHT IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By R. M. Wenley, Litt.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan. Pp. xv + 332. $1.50 net.

"This book is from many points of view one of the most interesting . . . that has appeared for many a day. It is a tribute from one great philosophical teacher to another, his predecessor. . . . For its true scholarship and its loftiness of thought, as well as for its minuteness of research and exceeding carefulness of statement, the book must rank high among biographies." — Professor F. H. Foster, in *The Bibliotheca Sacra.*

"Dr. Wenley has given us a most interesting and instructive account of one of his predecessors in the Chair of Philosophy in the University of Michigan. . . . We owe a deep debt of gratitude for the great pains he has expended on what has obviously been a labour of love. The way in which he has traced the philosophical development of his predecessor is masterly." — Professor John Watson, in *The Queen's Quarterly.*

"A more exhaustive biography, and we may add a more appreciative one, has rarely been written. . . . One can only say that of all the good fortunes that could befall such a man, the greatest is to have so worthy, eminent, and loyal a biographer. . . . Indeed, it is so good that the name of Morris will always be associated with that of Wenley. The book ought to inspire others who have the now rather dwindling faculty of appreciation, to give us similar memoirs of James, Royce, Münsterberg, Charles Pierce, and perhaps we might add, William T. Harris." — President G. Stanley Hall, in *The American Journal of Psychology.*

"It is impossible to read the book — and it is very readable — without feeling that Professor Wenley is peculiarly fitted to be its author. It is not only the fine qualities of style and ripe knowledge of men — these one would expect from a writer of Professor Wenley's reputation — but the remarkable personal sympathy with every phase of spiritual experience through which Morris passes, which especially impresses the reader. Rare glimpses of the biographer's own personality reveal a kindred spirit, who not only appreciates, but is one with his subject, because he has himself passed through the fire. This personal penetration is dominant, and produces a living artistic unity rare in literature; so that the book is no mere biographical study, but a living drama, a true Odyssey of the spirit." — *The Dial*, Chicago.

"The highest praise that can be bestowed on a book like this is that it gives dignity and ideal value to the commonplaces of our university life, — making of the election of courses a sacrament and of the giving of lectures in dingy recitation rooms moments in the evolution of a significant *Weltanschauung.* Such a tribute may be honestly paid to Professor Wenley's narrative. It rises to the nobility of its subject. One reads it with a growing appreciation of Michigan's contribution to thought, and turns the last page reluctantly, feeling that through the biographer's art he has for a time come into intimate contact with one of the intellectual forces of the nineteenth century, — has seen the world of ideas take a forward step under the impulse of one of our own clan — a citizen of no mean city." — Professor F. N. Scott, in *The Michigan Alumnus.*

"Professor Wenley's admirable account has a value not only for the alumni of Michigan but for a wider circulation. . . . In the task of giving Morris his personal and intellectual setting the author has been remarkably successful in reproducing the spirit and motives of New England thought and life in the middle of the nineteenth century. . . . The author, the many former students of Professor Morris, the University of Michigan, and teachers of philosophy are to be congratulated upon Professor Wenley's painstaking research and sympathetic interpretation." — Professor J. H. Tufts, in *The International Journal of Ethics.*

"The work is a biography in the sense of an interpretation of a life, in relation to that larger intellectual life in which the personality of Professor Morris . . . functioned. None but perfect work might be expected from the author. The degree of success with which he has accomplished his task is reflected in the words of President G. Stanley Hall, of Clark University, who regards the book as the best biography ever written of any American thinker. . . . Unquestionably such work should be undertaken only by eminent men who have the large view so needful for the proper setting of a great life." — *Michigan History Magazine.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

Size, 22.7 × 15.2 cm. 8°. Bound in cloth

LATIN AND GREEK IN AMERICAN EDUCATION, WITH SYMPOSIA ON THE VALUE OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES. Edited by Francis W. Kelsey. Pp. x + 396. $1.50 net.

CONTENTS

THE PRESENT POSITION OF LATIN AND GREEK, THE VALUE OF LATIN AND GREEK AS EDUCATIONAL INSTRUMENTS, THE NATURE OF CULTURE STUDIES.

SYMPOSIA ON THE VALUE OF HUMANISTIC, PARTICULARLY CLASSICAL, STUDIES AS A PREPARATION FOR THE STUDY OF MEDICINE, ENGINEERING, LAW, AND THEOLOGY.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE VALUE OF HUMANISTIC, PARTICULARLY CLASSICAL, STUDIES AS A TRAINING FOR MEN OF AFFAIRS.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE CLASSICS AND THE NEW EDUCATION.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE DOCTRINE OF FORMAL DISCIPLINE IN THE LIGHT OF CONTEMPORARY PSYCHOLOGY.

Owing to the unanticipated demand for this volume it is now out of print. A new edition is in preparation.

THE MENAECHMI OF PLAUTUS. The Latin Text, with a Translation by Joseph H. Drake, University of Michigan. Pp. xi + 130. Paper covers. $0.60 net.

This edition of the Menaechmi was prepared, with stage directions, as a libretto for the presentation of the play at the University of Michigan in 1890. It was revised and republished in 1916.

Distributed by the University of Michigan

FACSIMILE OF THE WASHINGTON MANUSCRIPT OF DEUTERONOMY AND JOSHUA IN THE FREER COLLECTION. With an Introduction by Henry A. Sanders. Pp. x, 201 heliotype plates. Ann Arbor, Michigan, The University of Michigan, 1910.

Limited edition, distributed only to Libraries, under certain conditions. A list of Libraries containing this Facsimile is printed in *University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, Volume VIII, pp. 351–353.

FACSIMILE OF THE WASHINGTON MANUSCRIPT OF THE FOUR GOSPELS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. With an Introduction by Henry A. Sanders. Pp. x, 372 heliotype plates and 2 colored plates. Ann Arbor, Michigan, The University of Michigan, 1912.

Limited edition, distributed only to Libraries, under certain conditions. A list of Libraries containing this Facsimile is printed in *University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, Volume IX, pp. 317–320.

Digitized by Google

Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities

Edited by PERCY GARDNER and FRANCIS W. KELSEY

THE PRINCIPLES OF GREEK ART

By PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., Lincoln and Merton Professor of Classical Archaeology in the University of Oxford.

Makes clear the artistic and psychological principles underlying Greek art, especially sculpture, which is treated as a characteristic manifestation of the Greek spirit. a development parallel to that of Greek literature and religion. While there are many handbooks of Greek archaeology, this volume holds a unique place.

New Edition. Illustrated. Cloth, $2.50

GREEK ARCHITECTURE

By ALLAN MARQUAND, Ph.D., L.H.D., Professor of Art and Archaeology in Princeton University.

Professor Marquand, in this interesting and scholarly volume, passes from the materials of construction to the architectural forms and decorations of the buildings of Greece, and lastly, to its monuments. Nearly four hundred illustrations assist the reader in a clear understanding of the subject.

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.25

GREEK SCULPTURE

By ERNEST A. GARDNER, M.A., Professor of Archaeology in University College, London.

A comprehensive outline of our present knowledge of Greek sculpture, distinguishing the different schools and periods, and showing the development of each. This volume, fully illustrated, fills an important gap and is widely used as a text-book.

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.50

GREEK CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

By A. H. J GREENIDGE, M.A., Late Lecturer in Hertford College and Brasenose College, Oxford.

Most authors in writing of Greek History emphasize the structure of the constitutions; Mr. Greenidge lays particular stress upon the workings of these constitutions. With this purpose ever in view, he treats of the development of Greek public law, distinguishing the different types of states as they appear.

Cloth, $1.50

GREEK AND ROMAN COINS

By G. F. HILL, M. A., of the Department of Coins and Medals in the British Museum.

All the information needed by the beginner in numismatics, or for ordinary reference, is here presented. The condensation necessary to bring the material within the size of the present volume has in no way interfered with its clearness or readableness.

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.25

GREEK ATHLETIC SPORTS AND FESTIVALS

By E. NORMAN GARDINER, M.A., Sometime Classical Exhibitioner of Christ Church College, Oxford.

With more than two hundred illustrations from contemporary art, and bright descriptive text, this work proves of equal interest to the general reader and to the student of the past. Many of the problems with which it deals — the place of physical training, games, athletics, in daily and national life — are found to be as real at the present time as they were in the far-off days of Greece.

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.50

ON SALE WHEREVER BOOKS ARE SOLD

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities — *Continued*

ATHENS AND ITS MONUMENTS

By CHARLES HEALD WELLER, of the University of Iowa.

This book embodies the results of many years of study and of direct observation during different periods of residence in Athens. It presents in concise and readable form a description of the ancient city in the light of the most recent investigations. Profusely illustrated with Half-tones and Line Engravings.

Illustrated. Cloth, $4.00

THE DESTRUCTION OF ANCIENT ROME

By RODOLFO LANCIANI, D.C.L., Oxford; LL.D., Harvard; Professor of Ancient Topography in the University of Rome.

Rome, the fate of her buildings and masterpieces of art, is the subject of this profusely illustrated volume. Professor Lanciani gives us vivid pictures of the Eternal City at the close of the different periods of history.

Illustrated. Cloth, $1.50

ROMAN FESTIVALS

By W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A., Fellow and Sub-Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.

This book covers in a concise form almost all phases of the public worship of the Roman state, as well as certain ceremonies which, strictly speaking, lay outside that public worship. It will be found very useful to students of Roman literature and history as well as to students of anthropology and the history of religion.

Cloth, $1.50

ROMAN PUBLIC LIFE

By A. H. J. GREENIDGE, Late Lecturer in Hertford College and Brasenose College, Oxford.

The growth of the Roman constitution and its working during the developed Republic and the Principate is the subject which Mr. Greenidge here set for himself. All important aspects of public life, municipal and provincial, are treated so as to reveal the political genius of the Romans in connection with the chief problems of administration.

Cloth, $2.50

MONUMENTS OF THE EARLY CHURCH

By WALTER LOWRIE, M.A., Late Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Rome.

Nearly two hundred photographs and drawings of the most representative monumental remains of Christian antiquity, accompanied by detailed expositions, make this volume replete with interest for the general reader and at the same time useful as a hand-book for the student of Christian archaeology in all its branches.

Illustrated. Cloth, $1.50

MONUMENTS OF CHRISTIAN ROME

By ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Ph.D., Sometime Associate Director of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, and formerly Professor of Archaeology and Ancient History in Princeton University.

"The plan of the volume is simple and admirable. The first part comprises a historical sketch; the second, a classification of the monuments." — *The Outlook.*

Illustrated. Cloth, $2.25

ON SALE WHEREVER BOOKS ARE SOLD

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google